

northern California operations, does not have an adequate staff and space to assist citizens in finding employment and that thousands of citizens have great difficulty in obtaining any assistance from the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

1533. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Letter from F. C. Seideman, Kenosha, Wis., in appreciation for the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded him as a member of the Selective Service System; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1534. Also, petition of the American Legion, Department of Wisconsin, relating to reconversion and industrial disputes, etc.; to the Committee on Labor.

1535. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Central Trades Council, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their objection to passage of House bill 5262; to the Committee on Labor.

1536. Also, petition of Local Union 131, United Construction Workers, United Mine Workers of America, A. F. of L., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their opposition to the Case bill; to the Committee on Labor.

1537. Also, petition of John C. Burt, 15 Park Row, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to vindicating authority in delimiting the powers of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1946

(Legislative day of Friday, January 18, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most holy and merciful God, the strength of our weakness, the refuge of our weariness, the Good Shepherd of our waywardness, in the searching light of Thy presence, we acknowledge and bewail our manifold sins and wickedness which we from time to time most grievously have committed, by thought, word, and deed, against Thy righteous law of love. In an hour of dire human need, Thou hast opened before us a potent ministry to all the earth. Save us from the pride of self-will, from enfeebling faults of judgment, from the blindness of prejudice, from vagueness of purpose, and from discouragement in temporary failure. Lift up our hearts in glad expectation because, with a new era of world cooperation at the door, redemption draweth nigh; enable us to trim our lamps and at the midnight cry go forth to meet the Bridegroom. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the Senate for the days from the 18th of January to the 7th of February, both inclusive, be approved without reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal for the various days mentioned by the Senator from Kentucky is approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communi-

cated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4908. An act to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5400. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

### REPORT ON UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the message.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 1161.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The account of expenditures set forth in the report is of so important a nature that the Chair thinks the report should be printed in the RECORD, and, without objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD, without the illustrations, for the information of the Senate.

The report, without the illustrations, is as follows:

### CHAPTER 1. SUMMARY OF THIRD QUARTER DEVELOPMENTS

The third quarter of 1945 brought final military victory to the United Nations. The end of hostilities greatly affected the problems of relief. VE-day enabled UNRRA to enter into full-scale operations in the liberated countries of Europe which required its aid, as well as to assist in the care and repatriation of millions of displaced persons freed from years of Nazi slave labor. With VJ-day, UNRRA could begin operations on a world-wide scale, as ports were opened in China. Shipping and supplies in adequate quantities became available for UNRRA's accelerated operations, including large supplies of military surplus stocks. As the supply problem diminished the financial problem grew, and by the end of the third quarter of 1945 virtual exhaustion of UNRRA's financial resources became its most immediate problem.

### SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES

1. At the end of the third quarter of 1945 cumulative shipments of relief materials from all sources totaled 2,126,222 long tons, valued at \$433,816,000—landed cost. Whereas about half of the shipments included in the total for the second quarter of 1945 were taken over from the civilian relief stocks of military authorities, almost all the supplies shipped during the third quarter were directly procured and shipped by UNRRA. Third quarter shipments, equivalent to more than 135 full shiploads, were more than double those of the preceding quarter. Included were 616,840 tons of food, 237,150 tons of industrial rehabilitation supplies, 106,865 tons of agricultural rehabilitation supplies, 56,558 tons of clothing, textiles, and footwear, and 7,811 tons of medical supplies.

2. As of September 30, UNRRA had expended or committed over 88 percent of its available resources. Of the \$1,268,750,254 comprising operating contributions to date—including the entire United States contribution—the sum of \$1,122,131,582 had been committed for relief and rehabilitation supplies and services. Of the \$15,415,334 available for administrative expenditures, \$11,692,128 had been committed. For all purposes, UNRRA had a balance of \$150,341,878 available for commitment as of the end of the third quarter of 1945.

3. Operations were stepped up during the third quarter in the countries of central, eastern, and southern Europe. Agreements were signed between UNRRA and the Governments of Poland, Albania, and the Dodecanese Islands. Increased quantities of supplies were shipped into Greece, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. Unloading problems were in part overcome by the opening of the ports of Gdynia and Gdansk for Poland, Bremerhaven and Hamburg for Czechoslovakia, and Trieste for Yugoslavia.

4. As of September 30, 4,323 UNRRA workers were employed in the operation of assembly centers established by the military for Allied displaced persons in Germany, while 449 other UNRRA personnel were in a forward staging area awaiting deployment into the field. About 1,300,000 displaced persons were still being cared for in these assembly centers. While negotiations were under way for UNRRA to take over direction of displaced persons operations from the military, UNRRA personnel were "winterizing" the centers.

5. Over 27,000 displaced persons had been repatriated from UNRRA's Middle East camps by the beginning of September, and a remaining 13,000 were being sent home as fast as shipping permitted.

6. The wrecking of inland transport systems during the war constituted a grave threat to the relief program. To overcome this, UNRRA had arranged for the procurement of approximately 50,000 trucks for Czechoslovakia, Greece, Poland, and Yugoslavia.

7. UNRRA's program of limited aid to Italy was in full operation, and most of the \$50,000,000 authorized for the Italian program had been committed. About 800,000 children and expectant and nursing mothers were receiving supplementary food in provinces south of Florence. Operations were beginning in certain northern provinces. School lunch programs were operating in Rome and Naples and soon would be extended throughout Italy.

8. VJ-day necessitated a rapid increase of UNRRA personnel in China. The draft of a basic UNRRA-Chinese Government agreement was in the final stages of negotiation in September. UNRRA medical personnel combated a cholera epidemic in the Chungking area during the third quarter. From June 2 to August 18 over 2,300 persons were given emergency hospitalization, and 500,000 were inoculated. Mortality among patients fell from 40 percent to about 10 percent. Procurement for China got under way on a large scale during this quarter.

9. While the countries of western Europe have been financing most of their own relief and rehabilitation needs, they have received through UNRRA large shipments of clothing contributed by citizens of the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. At the end of September approximately 3,000,000 pounds had been sent to Belgium, 7,000,000 to France, 4,000,000 to the Netherlands, and 1,000,000 to Norway.

10. Emergency relief shipments arrived in the Philippines in September. The shipments included 12,398,400 pounds of food and over 93,000 pounds of medical supplies. More than 4,000,000 pounds of contributed clothing were made available for shipment to the islands.

11. UNRRA doctors, nurses, and sanitation engineers were assisting various governments to reestablish public health and sanitation organizations for epidemic control. Portable X-ray units and hospital facilities were being shipped to liberated areas. UNRRA airplanes were spraying malaria-breeding swamps in Greece with DDT, and UNRRA welfare specialists were assisting the Greek Government to organize a nation-wide system of feeding and physical rehabilitation centers.

12. UNRRA continued to administer the International Sanitary Conventions, 1944, in connection with which a total of 15 issues of the Epidemiological Information Bulletin were published and distributed to health officials throughout the world.

#### EFFECT OF VICTORY

In September 1945 it was estimated that from 10,000,000 to 12,000,000 tons of food would be required within the next 12 months to augment supplies in the liberated countries of Europe, if millions of people were to be able to assume their responsibilities in rebuilding their homelands.

The transition from war to peace in almost every liberated country of Europe and the Far East was being met on empty stomachs. Europe faced its grimmest winter in modern times. Tragedy was not confined to hunger and the prospect of mass starvation. The Mediterranean countries reported millions of cases of malaria and tuberculosis, while diphtheria was of epidemic proportions in a large part of central and northern Europe. And while the European continent is in need of thousands of tons of medical supplies and hospital equipment, no region of the earth is in greater need of medical assistance than China. Authorities in China expect that the coming year will bring 200,000 cases of cholera, 6,000,000 of dysentery, 700,000 of typhoid, 500,000 of smallpox, 360,000 of diphtheria, and 100,000 of spinal meningitis. In urban centers few persons over 20 have escaped tubercular infection, and tuberculosis mortality runs to 3 per 1,000.

The desperate need of the liberated United Nations populations for relief and rehabilitation supplies and services is the aftermath of years of enemy occupation and military operations which turned their cities and farms into battle grounds. Under successive impacts of conquest, occupation, and military liberation, economic and physical deterioration was inevitable. The winter of 1945-46 brings a crisis in the recovery of the world from war.

However, military victory in all theaters of war opened the way to application of remedial measures on a world-wide basis, permitting the rapid acceleration of relief and rehabilitation assistance to areas where the needs were most urgent.

After the victory, supplies became available in sufficient quantities so that their lack no longer constituted a major handicap to UNRRA's operations. Prior to VE-day, shipping space and essential commodities were in extremely short supply, and UNRRA's requirements frequently gave way to military necessity. VJ-day removed additional supply restrictions and released many items which had been in short supply during the war. UNRRA was placed in a position to purchase large amounts of Army surpluses stock piled both in the United States and overseas, and also to obtain supplies for which procurement contracts had been canceled as a result of Army cut-backs. By the end of September UNRRA had procured \$90,000,000 worth of United States Government surpluses which were stored in this country. In addition, a joint mission of UNRRA and United States Government officials had gone to Europe to procure an additional \$150,000,000 worth of supplies from United States military surpluses available in the European and Mediterranean theaters, and plans were developed for the procurement of United States military surpluses in the Far Eastern theater.

Further large-scale purchases of military surpluses both in the United States and abroad were contemplated as additional funds from the initial United States contribution became available.

Victory not only improved the supply situation but also eased transportation. By the end of the third quarter of 1945 UNRRA had enough shipping space to take care of its overseas consignments, barring unforeseen contingencies. The liberation of China opened up that country's seaports to the Allies, and enabled UNRRA to go into its planned operation there. Hitherto, relief and rehabilitation activities had been negligible, as land routes into Free China were crowded with military transports and the cost of moving supplies by air was prohibitive for large-scale relief operations. In similar fashion, on the other side of the world, opening of new ports in the Baltic during the third quarter of 1945 permitted substantial increases in the movement of goods to Poland.

Because of the critical state of inland transport in Europe and the Far East, UNRRA has been sending trucks to these areas in increasing quantities. These trucks were procured principally from Army surpluses abroad.

Improvements in supply and shipping meant speedier procurement. By the end of the third quarter the principal factor limiting UNRRA was the lack of financial resources to continue procurement.

#### CHAPTER 2. UNRRA COUNCIL DECISIONS

The third session of the Council of UNRRA—composed of one representative from each member nation—was held in London between August 7 and August 25. The United States was represented at this session by Assistant Secretary of State William L. Clayton.

At its third session the Council adopted several resolutions expanding UNRRA's membership and its scope of operations and recommending that member nations provide additional financial support. Those resolutions are summarized below:

1. New members: The Council voted to admit three United Nations—Denmark, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic—which had not previously applied for membership in UNRRA. By general resolution the Council also authorized the Central Committee of UNRRA—consisting of the delegates of Canada, China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and the United States—to accept applications for membership from any other governments that are signatories to the Charter of the United Nations.

2. Scope of UNRRA operations: At its second session in September 1944 the UNRRA Council authorized a limited program of aid to Italy, supplementing the extensive relief operation conducted by the armies of the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada, and paid for by the governments of those nations. At the third session of the Council the United States delegate proposed that the burden of furnishing relief to Italy be transferred from the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada to UNRRA, and the Council agreed to authorize UNRRA operations in Italy to the extent necessary "to meet the urgent needs of the Italian population." The Council also agreed to authorize UNRRA operations in Austria when invited to do so by "the appropriate authorities exercising administrative control of that country." The burden of relief is now being met by France, the U. S. S. R., the United Kingdom, and the United States as the occupying authorities. Another resolution passed by the Council

<sup>1</sup> Canada and France were added to the membership of the Central Committee at the third session of the Council.

authorized UNRRA to operate in Korea and Formosa "upon the same terms and conditions as in other liberated areas."

Upon the recommendation of the United States delegate, the Council also clarified UNRRA's responsibilities with respect to displaced persons. UNRRA is now authorized to provide care on a temporary basis for the displaced nationals of any member nation; whether or not they desire to return to the territory of that nation at the present time.

3. Additional financial support: The Director General advised the Council that the supplies and services financed by the original contribution of each uninvaded member nation which was approximately equal to 1 percent of estimated national income for the year ending June 30, 1943, would be entirely consumed by midwinter. After considering the volume of urgent relief and rehabilitation needs falling within the scope of UNRRA's responsibility and comparing those needs with the ability of the uninvaded nations to meet them, the Council resolved to recommend a second contribution equal to 1 percent of the estimated annual national income of the uninvaded member nations. It is estimated that the additional 1 percent contributions will total approximately \$1,883,000,000, bringing the total contribution of the uninvaded nations to \$3,766,000,000. In making its recommendation, the Council expressed the expectation that UNRRA would complete its shipments to Europe not later than the end of December 1946 and to the Far East not later than the end of March 1947.

#### CHAPTER 3. OPERATIONS BY COUNTRY CENTRAL, EASTERN, AND SOUTHERN EUROPE

In the countries of central, eastern, and southern Europe in which UNRRA was supplying relief and rehabilitation supplies and services, operations moved into high gear during the quarter. Agreements were signed with Poland, the Dodecanese Islands, San Marino, and Albania. Supplies in increasing volume were dispatched to those countries and to Greece, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia. In the case of Czechoslovakia and Poland supply obstacles were partially overcome by the opening of the ports of Gdynia and Gdansk for Poland, and the recent opening of Bremerhaven and Hamburg for Czechoslovakia. Large-scale shipment of trucks to the countries in which UNRRA was operating had substantially eased the problem of internal distribution of supplies. In Italy the limited program for nursing and expectant mothers, children, and displaced Allied nationals was in full operation.

#### ALBANIA

The administration's operations in Albania got under way during the quarter. The UNRRA-Albania agreement was signed on August 1, and on August 8 the UNRRA mission entered that country.

The first shipload of UNRRA supplies reached Albania on August 21. By September 30, UNRRA had shipped a total of 20,000 tons there; 70 percent consisted of foodstuffs, primarily wheat and flour. Other supplies shipped to Albania during the quarter included clothing, medical supplies, fuel, and lubricants.

One of the difficulties in the handling of supplies for Albania is the small capacity of its ports. Until recently the chief port, Durres, was able to handle only 10,000 tons a month.

During the typhoid epidemics in Tirana and Durres, vaccines, water supply materials, and other medical supplies were airshipped to Albania. The Albanians have requested UNRRA to provide supplies for the maintenance of 25,000 Chamerian refugees. Tents for housing this group and an estimated 20,000 homeless Albanians are under procurement from Army surpluses in the Mediterranean theater.



## CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Cumulative shipments to Czechoslovakia through September 30, 1945, amounted to 154,000 gross long tons, valued at \$43,000,000. Of this figure 103,000 tons were shipped during the third quarter. Seventy-five percent of shipments originated in the Western Hemisphere and 25 percent in the Eastern.

Most of the cargoes continued to be shipped over the long sea route to Constanta and the single-track rail line across Rumania and Hungary to Czechoslovakia. Operations in Czechoslovakia have been seriously hindered by the overloading of the harbor facilities at Constanta and the rail route into the country. The German North Sea ports of Bremerhaven and Hamburg, the normal entry for Czechoslovakia, were expected to become available to UNRRA and aid materially in supplying the country.

Food supplies constituted approximately half of shipments, agricultural rehabilitation supplies, including seeds, were 30 percent; and clothing, textiles, and footwear, 12 percent. The balance consisted of industrial, medical, and sanitation supplies.

Despite UNRRA shipments total food resources provided an average of only 1,800 calories per person per day in September.

Perhaps the most serious damage suffered by Czechoslovakia during the final stages of the war was to its transportation system. This is still a major problem, because few of the destroyed bridges have been rebuilt and only 19 of the 29 bombed tunnels have been put into operation again. Since the railway and river systems cannot be adequately restored until 1946, trucks are essential. During September UNRRA started regular and substantial deliveries of surplus military trucks, and more than 2,000 of them had been delivered by September 30.

A survey of Slovak hospitals by an UNRRA health officer showed that they had been deprived of all essentials by the enemy. To relieve the situation the distribution of UNRRA hospital units and medical supplies has been speeded up. Small emergency depots of medical supplies are being assembled in Prague, Bratislava, and Kosice. UNRRA welfare officers have completed comprehensive surveys through Czechoslovakia and report that unless there is a continuous flow of supplies for children's welfare centers, nurseries, and other institutions, tuberculosis and malnutritional diseases will continue to increase.

## THE DODECANESE ISLANDS

Under agreement of August between the military administration of the Dodecanese Islands and UNRRA, UNRRA will assume supply responsibility early in 1946. UNRRA assumed financial responsibility for relief to the Dodecanese on August 1, 1945.

## GREECE

UNRRA's task in Greece has continued to be complex in character and difficult in execution, not only because of the degree of destruction and destitution brought about by the war and occupation, but also because of the country's peculiar economy.

In years of normal production some 30 percent of the food needed to meet Greece's annual food requirements must be imported. Current import needs are considerably higher because of a drastic decline in domestic cereal production as a result of the war and occupation. For example, although the average annual production for the years 1938-39 was 1,705,200 metric tons, the estimated 1945 production is only 713,000 metric tons.

Since UNRRA became responsible for relief operations in Greece, it has provided that country with an average of approximately 100,000 tons of food monthly. At the same time over 2,000 tractors and large quantities of fertilizers and pesticides have been delivered to rehabilitate local production. By September 30 UNRRA shipments had made available 50 percent of the fall and winter

requirements of nitrogenous fertilizers and two-thirds of the requirements for rock phosphate.

The number of draft and pack animals in Greece was reduced in appalling proportions as a result of the war. Out of the 965,000 head in 1938 only 487,000 remained by mid-June 1945. UNRRA has imported into the country an aggregate of 13,619 head of livestock, of which approximately 25 percent came from Cyprus and Italy. UNRRA also has provided bulls for artificial insemination to increase the livestock. Additional shipments are programmed for the future, but it is far beyond UNRRA's ability to replace all the lost livestock.

Before the war Greece had 1,660 miles of railways and 7,700 miles of roads. The railway system is totally destroyed, and its rehabilitation is a task UNRRA cannot undertake. If the transport burden is shifted to the highways, some 16,000 motor trucks would be required to transport the amount of freight that moved over the roads and railroads of Greece in 1939. To date UNRRA has made available to Greece some 4,500 trucks and plans to raise the number to more than 6,000 by the end of 1945.

Allied agencies working in Greece during the occupation agreed that 54 percent of the population were in desperate need of clothing and footwear. UNRRA has imported quantities of finished apparel and enough raw materials to keep the country's clothing industry fully occupied for at least 6 months. As of August 31, 10,299 long tons of raw material, clothing, textiles, and footwear had been shipped, and during September and October 2,243 long tons of used and new clothing were shipped. However, it will not be possible to clothe adequately the Greek population for some years to come.

War and occupation left behind an immense job in the fields of health and welfare. Malaria, tuberculosis, and other diseases prevail throughout the country. UNRRA field observers report that the malaria-infected population in some areas is more than 70 percent. According to estimates, half of the country's children are tubercular. To date UNRRA has provided approximately 1,250 tons of medical supplies. In addition, 12 airplanes have been allocated to Greece for malaria control. Of these, eight had reached the country by September 30. To combat tuberculosis, medical teams were organized to operate throughout Greece and radiological apparatus for mass examination was in operation in Athens and Salonika. Two-thirds of the displaced Greeks in UNRRA's Middle East camps have been repatriated. UNRRA refugee camps were operating in the northern part of Greece, furnishing food and clothing to the Greek refugees streaming in from Yugoslavia and Bulgaria.

## ITALY

During the months of July, August, and September, 1945, the operations of the Italy mission increased in range and in scope, within the limitations of the \$50,000,000 program established by the Council at its session in Montreal. Shipments through September 1945 amounted to 101,675 tons of supplies, of which about 28,000 tons were shipped during the third quarter.

By the end of the third quarter about 800,000 expectant and nursing mothers and children were receiving UNRRA supplementary food in provinces south of Florence and operations were under way in the provinces of Florence and Pistoia. School-lunch programs were being operated by UNRRA in Rome and Naples and will soon be extended throughout Italy.

In Italy UNRRA has been assisting in the care of three classes of displaced persons: United Nations nationals, stateless persons, and Italians displaced within the country. Care for displaced persons in the north was

still largely in the hands of the military, but the Allied Commission has authorized UNRRA to extend its program of financial assistance to displaced persons in northern Italy, heretofore closed to civilian agencies. At the end of September about 10,000 non-Italian displaced persons were being assisted through cash grants and assistance in kind.

UNRRA relief operations in Italy had been limited to \$50,000,000 and restricted to special fields in accordance with the Montreal resolution. Until August 31, 1945, the United States, United Kingdom, and Canadian military authorities were responsible for supplying Italy with the essential foodstuffs and raw materials necessary for the prevention of disease and unrest. For the months of September through December 1945 the United States Government participated through the Foreign Economic Administration and subsequently the Department of State. To avoid the interruption of the pipeline flow of vitally needed supplies, such as wheat, coal, etc., UNRRA was expected to initiate substantial shipments to Italy in January 1946. Under the expanded program approved at the third council session in London, it is estimated that about \$450,000,000 will be expended.

Relief and rehabilitation needs for Italy are estimated to be well in excess of a billion dollars. Years of warfare, internal upheaval, military operations, German demolition, and Allied bombing have left crucial shortages of food, clothing, medical services, and shelter. More than 1,000,000 persons were homeless, and 350,000 were refugees. The average daily ration provided about 900 calories. Ninety percent of the bridges were blown up, rolling stock and power lines were largely destroyed, and motor transport was badly depleted.

Flooding of reclaimed land, disintegration of drainage facilities, and shortage of food, clothing, medical services, and shelter combined to undermine health. The incidence of tuberculosis is three times the prewar rate, and several hundred tons of medical and sanitation supplies were needed immediately.

About 2,700 cases of medical supplies had been transferred to the Italian Government by UNRRA. These contained atabrine, digitals, vitamins, baby feeding requirements, surgical instruments, etc. UNRRA penicillin has been the only supply officially available in Italy for civilian use. Fifty ambulances have been given to the Italian Government thus far.

## POLAND

On September 14 UNRRA and the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity signed an agreement outlining the scope of UNRRA's activities in Poland and providing for the establishment of an UNRRA mission there. This agreement is similar to UNRRA agreements with other countries in which it is operating, providing for nondiscrimination in the distribution of supplies and for UNRRA observation of distribution. Because of the desperate need existing in Poland, UNRRA supplies have been sent there since March. By September 30 supplies shipped to Poland had reached a total of about 160,000 tons valued at nearly \$61,185,000. During the third quarter about 90,000 tons were shipped to Poland.

Until mid-August all shipments to Poland had to be made to Constanza and to be moved by rail and truck into the country. Now, however, the ports of Gdynia and Gdansk are open and the physical difficulties of supplying Poland are reduced. Destruction of Poland's transportation system made impossible full use of the port capacity and trucks now being delivered by UNRRA for the distribution of supplies are essential. As of October 12, approximately 3,000 trucks had arrived in Poland.

Reports from UNRRA's staff in Poland disclose the desperate situation in that country.

The food situation is critical and livestock is scarce. In 1945 the number of pigs, in comparison with 1938, decreased 74.1 percent; cattle decreased 48.4 percent; milk cows, 56.3 percent, and sheep 90 percent. Home production cannot supply the non-agricultural population with any animal proteins whatsoever. All animal proteins for the nonfarm population must be imported. The amount of milk available is not sufficient to cover even the lowest needs of the agricultural population. Furthermore, a serious reduction in the expected production of bread, grains, and potatoes has resulted in a grave shortage of the basic food needs for the entire population.

It has been estimated that 80 percent of the clothing of the Polish population has been worn out, looted, or destroyed. UNRRA staff members report that practically all children and women and at least half the men are without shoes. Quantities of supplies of contributed clothing, purchased textiles and footwear have been sent to Poland by UNRRA.

The health problem in Poland is also very serious. Tuberculosis, typhoid fever, venereal diseases, and dysentery are rampant. Estimates of reliable observers indicate that 10,000 persons are succumbing to diseases each month. Infant mortality is extremely high. The incidence of typhus in western Poland is particularly high as the result of war dislocation and break-down of sanitary facilities in the great movements of people from east to west. The need for medical supplies of all kinds is urgent, and as many of such supplies as possible are being sent by UNRRA.

#### YUGOSLAVIA

UNRRA shipments to Yugoslavia during the third quarter of 1945 amounted to about 330,000 tons. Yugoslavia was supplied entirely by UNRRA procurement beginning July 1, 1945. Prior to that time military supplies had been the primary means of civilian relief, but supplies shipped into the country between April 15 and June 30 were bought by UNRRA from Allied military authorities.

UNRRA supplies discharged in Yugoslavia during July amounted to 71,000 gross long tons, an increase of 40 percent over the June total. The rise in deliveries was due primarily to the use of the port of Trieste. About half of the supplies docked consisted of industrial and agricultural rehabilitation goods, medical supplies, and clothing and textiles.

During August 77,400 gross long tons of UNRRA supplies were landed in Yugoslavia, and in September 24 UNRRA ships landed 117,000 tons of supplies, more than two-thirds of which was food. Since September 1 a substantial increase in shipments to Yugoslavia was scheduled to help build stock piles in the interior areas of the country, which are isolated during the winter months.

To break Yugoslavia's transport bottleneck in the distribution of relief supplies, UNRRA dispatched more than 5,700 trucks and trailers during September. A majority of the vehicles were bought from the military surpluses in Italy.

Until the 1946 harvest, Yugoslavia will have to depend on imported cereal supplies and protective foods. Clothing and textiles, agricultural and industrial rehabilitation goods and medical supplies will have to be imported for some time to come. About 50 to 60 percent of all livestock was destroyed by war, and large segments of Yugoslavia's communications and industrial plants were destroyed or sabotaged during the occupation. The 1945 harvest will be only about 50 percent of normal because of the smaller area under crops and the severe drought that hit all of southeastern Europe.

UNRRA is helping Yugoslavia in reequipping and reestablishing its badly damaged hospital and medical services. A survey of

nutritional deficiency diseases undertaken in Sarajevo showed the majority of the children were suffering from rickets and other nutritional diseases. Similar surveys are planned on a larger scale. Health officers and staff personnel have started to work in the field. Work on typhus control continued, as did the survey on malaria control. A nurses' training program was in process of development. UNRRA welfare specialists were surveying children's institutions to determine their requirements for continued operations.

#### ETHIOPIA

A mission to Ethiopia, with the primary purpose of instituting a program of training in the fields of welfare, health, and medical services, was being organized and a chief of the mission was appointed.

#### WESTERN AND NORTHERN EUROPE

UNRRA had been engaged in a limited program to provide some emergency relief supplies to liberated countries that had not applied for general assistance. None of the member governments of western and northern Europe has requested UNRRA to provide relief and rehabilitation supplies and services on a broad scale, but some food and considerable quantities of contributed clothing were sent to help alleviate immediate distress in the months immediately following the end of the war in Europe.

#### FRANCE

Emergency supplies consigned to France were destined for use by war victims whose homes and household goods had been destroyed, and for Allied nationals displaced in the country. By the end of September 227 tons of food and clothing were consigned for shipment for the use of French war victims and 265 tons of food, clothing, and medical supplies were sent for displaced persons in France. In addition, 7,406,000 pounds of used clothing had been shipped to France, chiefly to clothe returning prisoners of war and deportees.

#### BELGIUM AND LUXEMBURG

The allocation of used clothing to Belgium and Luxembourg was 3,000,000 pounds. The Belgium authorities were responsible for re-allocation and delivery of 10 percent of the total to the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg. As of September 28, 3,098,420 pounds had been shipped to Belgium.

At the end of September 46 tons of emergency supplies allocated to Belgium had been shipped or handed over for shipment, and 78 tons of supplies allocated to Luxembourg had been delivered for shipment.

#### DENMARK

During the third quarter of 1945 Denmark requested supplementary relief supplies for Allied and stateless displaced persons in her territory. The number of such persons requiring assistance was estimated at 7,500. UNRRA undertook to supply quantities of used blankets, footwear, and medical supplies.

#### THE NETHERLANDS

One hundred ninety-eight tons of emergency relief supplies had been handed over to The Netherlands Government and an additional 75 tons were allocated. Final arrangements have been made for turning over 4,000,000 pounds of used clothing for The Netherlands proper and 2,000,000 pounds for the Netherlands East Indies.

#### NORWAY

UNRRA has delivered for shipment to Norway 136 tons of emergency relief supplies, and final arrangements have been made for turning over to the Norwegian authorities 1,000,000 pounds of contributed clothing. Norway has requested UNRRA's aid in obtaining quantities of gypsum, molasses, household equipment, hemp, and optical instruments.

#### THE FAR EAST AND THE PACIFIC

##### China

VJ-day represented the sudden transition of UNRRA activities in the Far East from a planning to an operational stage. Plans called for a rapid increase of field personnel. As of September 30, 1945, the staff of the China office consisted of 53 persons on regular appointments and 21 en route to China to assume their duties. Requests have been received from the China office for a total of 974 additional personnel for service there, about half of the persons to be recruited are scheduled for work with Chinese National Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and the Chinese Government.

Prior to VJ-day UNRRA activities in China were valuable even though necessarily limited in scope. An UNRRA medical mission arrived in Chungking early in August to combat the spread of cholera. UNRRA also shipped in 4 tons of anticholera supplies. From June 2 to August 18 more than 2,300 persons were hospitalized and 500,000 more were inoculated. Mortality among cholera cases, which reached 40 percent before the establishment of emergency hospitals, was reduced to between 5 percent and 15 percent, and the crisis in Chungking passed. UNRRA personnel was assisting the Chinese National Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in setting up medical establishments and in developing the relief and rehabilitation machinery in two liberated provinces, Kwangsi and Kweichow.

Following the Japanese surrender, UNRRA has been accelerating its program of supply shipments to China. In addition UNRRA has sought to develop a program of procurement of surplus military supplies. This program is being developed in categories which command high priority within the 6 months requirements for China and the China office has been provided with an advance of \$2,000,000 against which to make emergency purchases of locally available United States Government-owned excess and surplus supplies in China.

##### The Philippines

The first shipment of the emergency supplies, under UNRRA's \$1,000,000 emergency relief program for the Philippines arrived in the Philippines in mid-September and the second was scheduled to arrive at the end of September. These shipments included about 12,500,000 pounds of food and over 93,000 pounds of medical supplies. The arrival of these supplies resulted in an immediate and marked decrease in the prevailing inflated market prices.

In addition to the above supplies, contributed clothing amounting to 4,019,479 pounds was made available for shipment to the Philippines.

The UNRRA office established in Manila assisted the Philippine Government authorities. This office is also making preliminary arrangements for the purchase of suitable Army surpluses in the Philippines.

##### Korea and Formosa

At the third session of the UNRRA Council held in London in August Korea was designated as an area in which UNRRA was authorized to operate under the same terms and conditions as in other liberated areas. Letters have been dispatched to the American and Soviet military authorities occupying respectively the southern and northern zones of Korea, informing them of that country's eligibility for assistance and requesting liaison arrangements to enable UNRRA to plan appropriately for its activities in the areas concerned.

Relief and rehabilitation operations in Formosa are included in the general program for China.



## CHAPTER 4. SERVICE PROGRAMS

The UNRRA program is designed to relate supplies and services in a manner to bring maximum assistance to the people of the liberated countries. War and occupation not only resulted in physical destruction of hospitals and other institutions and facilities vital to the health and welfare of the liberated populations, but also in the disorganization and disruption of the administrative organizations which managed these institutions and facilities. For these reasons UNRRA is being called upon by governments of liberated areas to provide the services of a number of technical experts in the fields of health, welfare, displaced persons operations, and agricultural and industrial rehabilitation in order to aid the liberated nations in such fields and making maximum use of imported relief supplies and in developing programs which will make it possible for the countries to take care of their own problems in these fields as speedily as possible.

Each of the following sections describes a major type of service provided by UNRRA technicians.

## HEALTH AND EPIDEMIC CONTROL

UNRRA doctors, nurses, and sanitary engineers have been aiding the governments to reestablish and strengthen their public health and sanitation organizations, for the purposes of epidemic control and of raising the level of public health above its critically low state. Widespread undernourishment and the lack of proper clothing and footwear have made the populations of liberated areas particularly vulnerable to disease. The threat is increased by extensive war damage to housing, water systems, drains, sewers, and other facilities, creating conditions that lead to outbreaks of typhoid, typhus, and malaria.

The UNRRA program of health and epidemic control includes the publication of a semimonthly, Epidemiological Information Bulletin, distributed to health officials throughout the world, informing them of the danger spots in diseases and epidemics. Publication of this bulletin is part of UNRRA's larger task of administering the International Sanitary Conventions of 1944. A Bulletin of Communicable Diseases and Medical Notes is also prepared in the European Regional Office in London.

By September 30 approximately 200 doctors, nurses, and sanitary engineers were employed on the UNRRA staffs of the various country missions, exclusive of those employed in the displaced persons operations in Europe and the Middle East. In addition to helping governments determine their needs for medical and sanitary supplies, and advising them on the general organization of public health services, these technicians have been organizing immediate programs to combat malaria and tuberculosis, two diseases so prevalent in Europe that they have lowered the level of health to the point where elementary economic reconstruction has been placed in jeopardy.

## MALARIA CONTROL

Substantial increases in the incidence of malaria have occurred in much of Europe, particularly in the Balkan states. About 85 percent of the area of Greece is now malarial, with an annual rate of over a million cases resulting in approximately 5,000 deaths.

In the Pontine area of Italy the percentage of malaria has jumped from 2 to 35 as a result of war damage to the pumping system which formerly drained the marshes. UNRRA doctors and sanitary engineers have been working closely with Greek and Italian officials in setting up programs for ditching and draining mosquito-breeding areas. They were training local personnel in the use of DDT for spraying infested areas and were spraying swamp areas in Greece with DDT,

using aircraft purchased from United States Army surpluses. In addition UNRRA supplied large quantities of atabrine and quinine for treatment of approximately 2,500,000 victims.

## TUBERCULOSIS CONTROL

Although exact statistics are not yet available on the incidence of tuberculosis in the liberated areas, it is apparent that it has increased to epidemic proportions. In Rome, for example, it is known to have more than doubled between 1940 and 1944, and in Poland it has reached unprecedented proportions.

To aid in the detection and isolation of active cases, UNRRA is supplying portable X-ray units to the liberated areas and UNRRA physicians are helping the governments organize surveys in both urban and rural areas. Thus far, Greece, Italy, and Yugoslavia have been particularly active in this respect. In these countries UNRRA physicians have been helping organize local groups to conduct antituberculosis educational campaigns.

War damage to hospitals has made it difficult to hospitalize even serious tuberculosis cases. Approximately half of the prewar tubercular hospital facilities were destroyed in Greece, and about one-fifth of all hospitals beds in Italy are demolished. As one of the elements in its health and epidemic control programs, UNRRA has been procuring and shipping equipment to reestablish destroyed hospital facilities.

## WELFARE SERVICES

As an aftermath of the war, governmental authorities in the liberated areas are faced with urgent problems in providing both the basic necessities and satisfying the special needs of the more vulnerable groups in the population—the children, the aged, the disabled, and those totally without resources. To assist the governments in developing programs to meet the needs of these groups, UNRRA had made available the services of about 50 welfare specialists, exclusive of those employed in displaced persons operations. Major welfare problems which these experts were helping the authorities to solve include:

1. The organization of administrative machinery for the distribution of relief supplies to persons without resources.
2. The restoration and development of facilities and programs for the care of war-victimized, orphaned, homeless, and other children and other groups requiring special care, such as the aged and physically handicapped.
3. The organization and training of local personnel to operate the various welfare programs.

## RESTORATION OF SOCIAL WELFARE MACHINERY

The war disorganized welfare administration in the areas occupied by the enemy. In Italy and in Greece particularly, the governments have found it necessary to develop new channels for distribution of relief supplies. In Greece, UNRRA has been helping the Government to organize a nation-wide system of feeding centers to distribute relief in an effective and equitable manner, and UNRRA personnel have been assisting in the training of officials who will administer the country's welfare programs.

In Italy, where UNRRA has been providing a limited program of aid, its personnel was helping to determine which areas were most in need of aid and which mothers and children were most in need of supplementary feeding from UNRRA supplies. UNRRA personnel has also been providing instruction in the use and preparation of UNRRA foods.

## CHILD CARE

It is reported that 600,000 children in Poland, 575,000 children in Yugoslavia, and 50,000 in Greece have been deprived of one or both parents or been left homeless by the

war. Moreover, the inadequacy of food rations available to the general population requires that the governments organize supplementary feeding programs for children. The magnitude of the special programs being undertaken or planned by the governments receiving UNRRA aid may be seen from the following table:

TABLE 1.—Child-welfare programs planned by governments receiving UNRRA aid

| Country             | Estimated population 18 years of age and under | To receive supplementary feedings <sup>1</sup> | To receive day, residential, and other care <sup>2</sup> |
|---------------------|--|--|--|
| Albania.....        | 450,000  | (2)  | (2)  |
| Czechoslovakia..... | 4,700,000                                      | 750,000  | 800,000  |
| Greece.....         | 2,500,000                                      | 1,000,000                                      | 430,000  |
| Italy.....          | 15,000,000                                     | 1,750,000                                      | 1,250,000  |
| Poland.....         | 7,000,000                                      | 600,000  | 600,000  |
| Yugoslavia.....     | 6,000,000                                      | 500,000  | 575,000  |

<sup>1</sup> Columns (3) and (4) are not exclusive.

<sup>2</sup> No information available on programs planned by the government.

UNRRA welfare specialists have been aiding the various governments in surveying the over-all child-care problem and in determining the supplies necessary to reestablish children's institutions and facilities for feeding. They were also helping to train local workers to assume the child-care job.

## CARE AND REPATRIATION OF DISPLACED PERSONS

A major responsibility of UNRRA has been the care of United Nations nationals displaced in other countries as a result of enemy action and arranging for their return to their national homelands. This job required that additional emergency supplies be sent for the use of persons displaced into areas not in themselves eligible for UNRRA assistance—such areas as the Middle East and Germany.

In countries receiving general assistance through UNRRA shipments included supplies for the needs of displaced persons as well as for those of the indigenous population. In Germany UNRRA was providing supplementary commodities such as blankets, clothing, and welfare supplies for use of displaced persons.

## MIDDLE EAST

In May 1944 UNRRA assumed the responsibility of caring for about 40,000 Greek, Yugoslav, and Polish refugees in the Middle East. They were housed in six camps taken over from the British military authorities. In addition to providing the basic essentials of food, clothing, shelter, and medical care, UNRRA worked with the refugees to develop workshops, schools, nurseries, recreational programs, and other community activities.

Repatriation of these refugees began as soon after their countries were liberated as shipping became available, and at the beginning of September slightly more than 27,000 of the refugees, comprising about 8,400 Greeks, 15,400 Yugoslavs, and 2,900 from the Dodecanese Island had been repatriated. The 13,000 who remained in the Middle East camps were being sent home as quickly as transportation facilities became available.

The repatriation of another group, approximately 40,000 Polish refugees now in camps scattered throughout Africa, may also become UNRRA's responsibility.

## GERMANY

In Germany UNRRA has assisted the American, British, and French military authorities in their displaced persons operations. UNRRA's activities have been based upon an agreement signed with SHAEF in November 1944, under which UNRRA undertook to supply teams of workers to assist the military authorities in the care and repatriation of displaced persons in the SHAEF zones. The first UNRRA staff was called forward in

March 1945. As of September 30, 4,323 UNRRA workers were working in camps and assembly centers established by the military, 449 additional personnel were in a forward staging area awaiting deployment into the field.

TABLE 2.—Status of displaced persons in western Germany on selected dates, June to September 1945

| Date          | Number repatriated | Number remaining |
|---------------|--------------------|------------------|
| June 18.....  | 3,076,000          | 2,084,000        |
| July 30.....  | 4,166,000          | 2,031,000        |
| Sept. 30..... | 5,276,000          | 1,342,000        |

UNRRA teams consisted of up to 13 persons, including doctors, nurses, welfare specialists, and administrative officers. They worked under the direction of military authorities who have had final responsibility for supplies, shelter, and transport, as well as for determining basic policies. However, responsibility for administration of the centers was being assumed increasingly by the UNRRA teams, and in a large number of centers the military detachment had already been withdrawn.

Of the 6,600,000 displaced persons and slave laborers handled by the military authorities in western Germany, about 5,300,000 have been repatriated and 1,300,000 were still being cared for in the assembly centers as of September 30. About two-fifths of these remaining displaced persons were in the American zone. The progress of repatriation is indicated in table 2.

The rate of repatriation of those still remaining would necessarily be slower than in the past. A relatively large number were "stateless," and many had not yet indicated a wish to return to their countries.

The following table indicates the number of displaced persons remaining in assembly centers in western Germany, on selected dates.

TABLE 3.—Number of displaced persons in Germany, by nationality, July to September 1945

| Nationality                         | July 12   | Aug. 1    | Sept. 4   | Sept. 30  |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Total.....                          | 2,276,000 | 2,174,000 | 1,491,000 | 1,342,000 |
| Czechoslovak.....                   | 11,000    | 5,000     | 3,000     | 4,000     |
| Greek.....                          | 10,000    | 9,000     | 5,000     | 1,000     |
| Italian.....                        | 278,000   | 238,000   | 83,000    | 10,000    |
| Polish.....                         | 881,000   | 600,000   | 846,000   | 817,000   |
| Russian.....                        | 568,000   | 475,000   | 62,000    | 35,000    |
| Yugoslav.....                       | 113,000   | 94,000    | 46,000    | 28,000    |
| Western European.....               | 13,000    | 10,000    | 6,000     | 6,000     |
| Ex-enemy.....                       |           | 240,000   | 211,000   | 207,000   |
| Miscellaneous and unclassified..... | 402,000   | 203,000   | 229,000   | 234,000   |

Negotiations were proceeding with the military for UNRRA to take over the direction of the displaced persons operations. Pending the conclusion of these discussions UNRRA was assisting the military in "winterizing" the displaced persons centers and in introducing certain health and welfare measures necessary for the comfort and well-being of the displaced persons.

#### AUSTRIA

In June 1945, UNRRA agreed to assist the United States military authorities in Austria with their displaced persons operations under arrangements similar to those made with authorities in Germany. Later, similar arrangements were made with the British and French military staffs in the country. On September 30, 276 UNRRA workers had been deployed into assembly centers and camps in Aus-

tria. Military authorities reported about 120,000 displaced persons of United Nations nationality in the United States and British zones in Austria at the end of October. An additional 25,000 were estimated to be in the French zone. Reports indicated that these totals might be increased because of the large number of displaced persons now outside assembly centers who might ask for aid when cold weather sets in.

#### THE FAR EAST

The staggering problem of repatriating the war-dislocated populations of the Far East was the subject of exploratory discussions between UNRRA and the member governments concerned during the third quarter of 1945. Although precise information as to the number and location of displaced persons was not immediately available, UNRRA was attempting to ascertain the conditions and needs which will govern its activities in this connection and is prepared to assume responsibility as called upon to act by the member governments.

UNRRA already had participated in these areas in movements of displaced persons back to their homelands. In September UNRRA and the American Advisory Committee, a voluntary agency, assisted the Chinese National Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in a movement of persons dislocated within China. In August, at the request of Chinese authorities and the Philippine Government, UNRRA undertook the repatriation of Chinese nationals who had been brought to the Philippines by the Japanese as forced labor.

#### CHAPTER 5. SUPPLY OPERATIONS

As of June 30, 1945, UNRRA's cumulative shipments totaled 1,100,993 tons, with a landed cost value of \$217,431,000. Three months later the shipment totals had approximately doubled. As of September 30, cumulative shipments amounted to 2,126,222 tons, with a landed cost value of \$433,816,000.<sup>1</sup>

By the end of September the availability of shipping was no longer a major limiting factor in UNRRA's operations. Commodities were also available in sufficient quantities, except for a few items such as sugar, oils and fats, rice, and cotton textiles, which remain in seriously short supply throughout the world. The principal limitation on UNRRA's ability to meet relief and rehabilitation needs is now the amount of money and materials which the member nations are willing to contribute.

#### RATE OF COMMITMENT OF FUNDS

UNRRA must commit its funds to procure supplies several weeks or months before the supplies are actually shipped, the time varying with the nature of the commodity. Most staple foods can be ordered, delivered to port, and loaded on board ships within a relatively short time, but items such as drugs, tractors, and trucks may take several months or longer to obtain.

In order to keep up a steady flow through the supply pipe line, UNRRA had found it necessary by September 30—when, as already noted, \$433,816,000 worth of supplies had been shipped—to commit an additional amount of approximately \$600,000,000 for the purchase of other commodities. Those funds were being used to procure materials in the United States and many other areas, including the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, India, South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Egypt, Iraq, Iran, and Latin America.

<sup>1</sup> The cumulative figures are computed on the basis of the vessels which have cleared port during the period. The cumulative figures given in previous reports were computed on the basis of the vessels which were being loaded during the period, and are therefore slightly higher for any given period.

TABLE 4.—Composition of UNRRA supplies shipped from all sources as of Sept. 30, 1945<sup>1</sup>

| Supply program   | Estimated cost        |          | Gross long tons |          |
|--|-----------------------|----------|-----------------|----------|
|  | United States dollars | Per cent | Tons            | Per cent |
| Food.....  | 136,203,000           | 48       | 1,058,199       | 67       |
| Clothing, textiles, and footwear.....                                    | 87,967,000            | 31       | 81,539          | 5        |
| Agricultural rehabilitation.....   | 23,919,000            | 8        | 169,480         | 11       |
| Industrial rehabilitation.....   | 22,538,000            | 8        | 250,689         | 16       |
| Medical and sanitation.....  | 13,223,000            | 5        | 11,315          | 1        |
| Total (FAS. basis).....  | 283,850,000           | 100      | 1,571,222       | 100      |
| Ocean transportation.....  | 44,966,000            |          |                 |          |
| Supplies acquired from military through June 30, 1945 <sup>2</sup> ..... | 105,000,000           |          | 555,000         |          |
| Grand total.....   | 433,816,000           |          | 2,126,222       |          |

<sup>1</sup> Does not include supplies estimated to amount to \$10,000,000 taken over from the military for the UNRRA camps, or supplies procured from Army surpluses in continental Europe since Aug. 1, 1945.

<sup>2</sup> Pending a complete inventory, final figures on the composition and total amount of these supplies are not available. These supplies were originally purchased by the military authorities for civilian relief in the Balkans and were transferred to UNRRA on the termination of military responsibility for relief.

#### PROCUREMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

As of September 30, Congress had appropriated \$800,000,000 for UNRRA. After deducting allocations for administrative expenses, relief and rehabilitation services, and the cost of warehousing and ocean shipping, \$753,316,000 remained for the purchase of supplies. UNRRA had committed this entire amount by September 30, \$660,316,300 going for the purchase of supplies from sources within the United States and from United States military surpluses overseas. The remaining \$93,000,000, the so-called convertible funds which UNRRA is authorized to expend outside the United States, was committed for the purchase throughout the world of scarce supplies which cannot be procured in this country.

#### SURPLUSES

Of the \$660,316,300 committed from the United States contribution by September 30, approximately \$64,000,000 had been earmarked for the purchase of surpluses from agencies of the United States Government. The effect of those purchases—and the sizable purchases of Government surpluses which UNRRA plans to make in the future—is to return the purchase price to the United States Treasury.

Also in September a joint mission was sent to Europe by the United States Government and UNRRA to procure an additional \$150,000,000 worth of supplies from the United States military surpluses located in the European and Mediterranean theaters of war. A tentative break-down of the surplus supplies to be requisitioned in those theaters follows:

|  |              |
|--|--------------|
| Industrial rehabilitation items.....   | \$83,000,000 |
| Agricultural rehabilitation items..... | 27,000,000   |
| Food.....                              | 22,000,000   |
| Clothing, textiles, and footwear.....  | 10,000,000   |
| Medical supplies and equipment.....    | 8,000,000    |
| Total.....                             | 150,000,000  |

The above list includes some 200 locomotives and more than 40,000 trucks. Available food supplies include individual Army field rations, canned meats, meat hash and stew, concentrated citrus fruit juices, and miscellaneous foodstuffs. Substantial quantities of soap, blankets, footwear, and medical sup-



piles are included in the surplus supplies. By the end of September surplus United States Army trucks were being delivered by UNRRA to Greece, Yugoslavia, Poland, and Czechoslovakia.

#### PROCUREMENT IN OTHER COUNTRIES

As in the United States, the rate of procurement in other countries has been sharply accelerated since VJ-day.

As of September 30, UNRRA had committed virtually the entire Canadian operating contribution of approximately \$69,000,000, since many items which are not obtainable elsewhere have recently been available in Canada. Deliveries of Canadian trucks, for example, were being made to Poland and Czechoslovakia at the rate of 200 per day late in September.

Because the supply situation in the United Kingdom is still tight, UNRRA had only committed approximately one-half, the equivalent of \$149,828,166 of the United Kingdom operating contribution by September 30. A substantial part of those funds is being used to pay for British military surpluses, including trucks and medical supplies, now available to UNRRA. The equivalent of an additional \$40,000,000 has been allocated for the payment of freight charges on British vessels.

Funds contributed by Australia, New Zealand, India, and South Africa have been committed for a variety of commodities obtainable in those countries, such as raw wool, raw cotton, surplus military clothing, structural steel, peanuts, tea, jute, and burlap. Almost \$25,000,000 had been committed by September 30 for purchases in Latin America of items such as sugar, rice, fish, animal feeds, pulses, cotton fabrics, hides, and twine.

#### SHIPMENTS THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30

As shown in table 4, page 32, food accounted for the largest share of UNRRA shipments through September 30, 1945, amounting to two-thirds of the total tonnage and to about 50 percent of the total value. Food shipments probably will continue in first place until the receiving countries bring in their 1946 harvests. Finished clothing and footwear and the raw materials required to manufacture those items followed food in importance. Recipient governments have asked that the highest priority be placed on shipments of medical supplies, and the speedy delivery of UNRRA drugs and medicines already has helped to prevent widespread epidemics in Europe and China. Shipments of agricultural and industrial rehabilitation supplies, difficult to procure but most useful in getting the war-shattered economies on a self-sustaining basis, have been steadily mounting.

Table 5, page 39, breaks down shipments through September 30 according to countries of destination. Limitations on port-reception capacity and inland transport facilities continued to hamper deliveries during the July-September quarter, but these obstacles were being gradually overcome.

#### SHIPMENTS OF FOOD

During the third quarter UNRRA shipped 616,840 tons of food, with an estimated value of \$75,591,000. Over 75 percent was in the form of grain, mainly wheat and flour. Except for wheat and wheat products, however, UNRRA's food shipments failed to augment local food supplies sufficiently to meet minimum subsistence requirements.

#### CLOTHING, TEXTILES, AND FOOTWEAR

By September 30 UNRRA had shipped 81,539 tons of clothing, textiles, footwear, and raw materials for their manufacture, having a total value of \$87,967,000. UNRRA was increasing shipments of raw materials

for the manufacture of clothing by the liberated areas themselves. Eighty-seven percent of the UNRRA raw-cotton program for 1945 will be met from United States supplies, involving a total expenditure of \$43,200,000. The procurement of raw wool in the United States has thus far amounted to \$21,000,000.

Supply shortages continued to limit UNRRA's shipment of blankets, footwear, and piece goods during the quarter. At the end of September about 2,000,000 pairs of shoes had been shipped to liberated areas.

#### MEDICAL AND SANITATION SUPPLIES

By the end of the quarter approximately 75 percent of the basic program for medical supplies to Albania, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Italy, Poland, and Yugoslavia had been procured and made available for shipment. A large portion of this amount had already been shipped, including drugs, hospital equipment, surgical instruments and dressings, X-ray equipment, laboratory equipment and supplies, dental equipment, DDT and sprayers, which are urgently required in malaria control.

The medical program has not been hampered by shortages of supplies except in the case of penicillin, for which the need far exceeds the supplies available to UNRRA. Thus far about 75 percent of the medical supplies purchased have come from military surpluses, which are expected to continue to be the chief source of future procurement.

#### AGRICULTURAL REHABILITATION SUPPLIES

By the end of the third quarter, UNRRA had shipped 69,480 tons of agricultural rehabilitation supplies with a value of \$23,919,000. Greece, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Yugoslavia had received the essential supplies and equipment for their 1945 fall harvesting and seeding operations, and the delivery of those vital items should substantially reduce the need for imported food in 1946. Thirty-six thousand tons of seeds had been shipped by the end of September. The short supply of pesticides, however, pre-

vented 1945 requirements from being fully met. Shipments of farm tractors were small during the July-September quarter, but a sizable procurement program has been initiated.

The depletion of European livestock has been so great that UNRRA supplies will fill only a very small part of the loss. Despite the shortage of livestock boats, however, some 20,000 animals had been delivered by the end of September.

#### INDUSTRIAL REHABILITATION SUPPLIES

Shipments of industrial rehabilitation supplies increased sharply during the third quarter. The value of shipments in September was several times that of shipments in July. Most of the increase resulted from the movement of trucks, essential to the efficient and economical management of a relief program. The trucks permit wider distribution and consumption of local supplies, thus reducing the need for bulk imports and they also facilitate the rapid distribution of the supplies which UNRRA itself brings into the country. Most of the trucks are being obtained from United States military surpluses.

#### CONTRIBUTED SUPPLIES

Over 100,000,000 pounds of used clothing contributed by the people of the United States in the national clothing collection last spring were on their way to the liberated areas of Europe and the Far East by the end of September. The outstanding success of this collection, sponsored by UNRRA in cooperation with American voluntary agencies for foreign relief, stimulated the organization of a second Nation-wide victory clothing collection, to begin on January 7. UNRRA also organized a victory collection of canned food, in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture, the United States Department of Education, and other agencies, to provide an opportunity to individuals, groups, and organizations to donate commercially canned food for overseas relief.

TABLE 5.—Quantities and estimated value of supplies shipped by UNRRA, cumulative through Sept. 30, 1945<sup>1</sup>

| Type of supply                                     | Total     | Country          |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  | Other UNRRA operations <sup>2</sup> |
|--|-----------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
|  |           | Albania          | China            | Czechoslovakia   | Greece           | Italy            | Poland           | Yugoslavia       |                                     |
| Gross long tons                                    |           |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                                     |
| Total.....   | 2,126,222 | 20,044           | 213              | 153,868          | 1,215,112        | 101,675          | 156,608          | 471,212          | 7,490                               |
| Food.....  | 1,058,199 | 14,219           | 13               | 83,428           | 514,127          | 97,445           | 84,733           | 262,693          | 1,241                               |
| Clothing, textiles, and footwear.....              | 81,539    | 337              | -----            | 18,532           | 13,004           | 2,313            | 25,358           | 21,090           | 905                                 |
| Agricultural rehabilitation.....                   | 169,480   | 2,459            | 6                | 41,678           | 55,774           | 73               | 28,292           | 41,186           | 12                                  |
| Industrial rehabilitation.....                     | 250,689   | 2,895            | -----            | 8,305            | 185,962          | 503              | 14,872           | 32,857           | 5,295                               |
| Medical and sanitation.....                        | 11,315    | 134              | 194              | 1,925            | 1,245            | 1,341            | 3,353            | 3,086            | 37                                  |
| Supplies acquired from military <sup>3</sup> ..... | 555,000   | -----            | -----            | -----            | 445,000          | -----            | -----            | 110,000          | -----                               |
| Thousands of United States dollar equivalents      |           |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                                     |
| Total.....   | 433,816   | 2,570            | 219              | 42,840           | 168,194          | 20,475           | 61,185           | 89,666           | 3,701                               |
| Food.....  | 136,203   | 1,274            | 4                | 13,589           | 56,832           | 14,189           | 18,954           | 31,085           | 276                                 |
| Clothing, textiles, and footwear.....              | 87,967    | 548              | -----            | 17,865           | 12,808           | 4,500            | 27,517           | 23,795           | 928                                 |
| Agricultural rehabilitation.....                   | 23,919    | 326              | 3                | 5,904            | 5,924            | 35               | 6,139            | 5,582            | 6                                   |
| Industrial rehabilitation.....                     | 22,538    | 272              | -----            | 2,912            | 7,099            | 250              | 4,556            | 5,032            | 2,417                               |
| Medical and sanitation.....                        | 13,223    | 150              | 212              | 2,570            | 1,342            | 1,495            | 4,019            | 3,361            | 74                                  |
| Ocean transportation.....                          | 44,966    | ( <sup>4</sup> ) | ( <sup>4</sup> ) | ( <sup>4</sup> ) | ( <sup>4</sup> ) | ( <sup>4</sup> ) | ( <sup>4</sup> ) | ( <sup>4</sup> ) | ( <sup>4</sup> )                    |
| Supplies acquired from military <sup>3</sup> ..... | 105,000   | -----            | -----            | -----            | 84,189           | -----            | -----            | 20,811           | -----                               |

<sup>1</sup> The figures cover the cargo of the vessels that actually sailed (cleared) from their ports of loading. They do not include cargoes on ships which presented for loading (berthed) during the period but has not yet cleared. They also do not include supplies estimated to amount to \$10,000,000, taken over from the military for the UNRRA camps or trucks procured from Army surpluses in continental Europe since Aug. 1, 1945.

<sup>2</sup> Includes shipments to UNRRA camps, shipments under the Emergency Relief Program for Western Europe, and shipments for displaced persons operations.

<sup>3</sup> Estimated supplies bought from the military through June 30, 1945; final figures are not yet available.

<sup>4</sup> Ocean freight costs not distributed by country.

## CHAPTER 6. UNRRA FINANCE

During the third quarter of 1945 the Administration was reaching the limit of its available fiscal resources, despite the fact that its job was only partially completed. In order to stave off mass epidemics, starvation, and unrest this coming winter in the liberated lands, UNRRA looked to the 31 uninvaded nations for additional contributions. At the end of September the fulfillment of various national authorizations of funds, in particular that of the United States, was required to provide UNRRA with the means for continuing adequate operations through the remainder of the calendar year.

## CONTRIBUTIONS OF MEMBER GOVERNMENTS

At its first session, held in November 1943, the UNRRA Council recommended that each member government whose home territory had not been occupied by the enemy should contribute an amount approximately equivalent to 1 percent of its national income for the year ending June 30, 1943. During the third UNRRA Council session, held in August 1945, it was recommended that the 31 uninvaded nations make available an additional 1 percent contribution to enable UNRRA to terminate operations in Europe by the end of 1946 and in the Far East by the end of the first quarter of 1947.

UNRRA's funds are earmarked for two purposes—operating and administrative. The operating budget is financed from the contributions of the uninvaded nations. The administrative budget is financed not only from the above contributions of the uninvaded nations, but also from administrative contributions levied on the 16 nations which were liberated from enemy occupation.

By September 30, 1945, total contributions authorized by the 47 member governments, or in process of authorization, amounted to \$1,882,759,991. Of this amount \$1,866,116,241 consisted of operating contributions of 26 uninvaded countries, including the United States. Five nations had not made contributions by September 30. Amounts totaling three-fourths of these operating contributions, or \$1,268,750,254, had been paid or were available on request and the balance of \$597,365,987 was in process of contribution.

An amount less than 1 percent of the total contributions or \$16,643,750 was to be provided for administrative purposes by the 47 member governments. By September 30, 1945, \$15,415,334 had been paid and the balance of \$1,228,416 was payable in the remaining months of 1945.

Total contributions, operating and administrative, are summarized below:

TABLE 6.—Status of UNRRA funds as of Sept. 30, 1945

(In United States dollar equivalents)

|  | Total funds   | Operating funds | Administrative funds |
|--|---------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| Total contributions authorized or in process of authorization..... | 1,882,759,991 | 1,866,116,241   | 16,643,750           |
| Less: Contributions in process.....                                | 598,594,403   | 597,365,987     | 1,228,416            |
| Contributions paid or available on request.....                    | 1,284,165,588 | 1,268,750,254   | 15,415,334           |
| Less: Contributions committed by UNRRA.....                        | 1,133,277,798 | 1,122,131,582   | 11,146,216           |
| Contributions available for commitment by UNRRA.....               | 150,887,790   | 146,618,672     | 4,269,118            |

TABLE 7.—Allocations, obligations, and expenditures of funds from United States appropriation for UNRRA as of Sept. 30, 1945

| Classification  | Allocations   | Obligations   | Expenditures |
|---|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| Supplies.....   |               |               |              |
| Clothing, textiles, and shoes.....                            | \$162,270,203 | \$131,313,322 | \$31,779,678 |
| Food.....   | 133,309,421   | 133,309,421   | 29,483,800   |
| Agricultural rehabilitation supplies.....                     | 36,042,116    | 70,513,271    | 15,246,915   |
| Industrial rehabilitation supplies.....                       | 65,222,317    | 36,743,436    | 23,071,454   |
| Medical and sanitation supplies.....                          | 31,199,184    | 20,221,055    | 78,222       |
| United States property located overseas.....                  | 157,190,100   | 151,419,106   | -----        |
| Reserve for accessorial costs.....                            | 28,035,662    | 28,035,662    | 1,036,887    |
| Unallotted allocation balances.....                           | 44,720,297    | -----         | -----        |
| Total supplies.....   | 658,090,100   | 531,555,273   | 101,590,956  |
| Services.....   |               |               |              |
| Ocean transportation.....                                     | 21,700,000    | 21,346,321    | 188,253      |
| Relief and rehabilitation.....                                | 893,805       | 790,852       | 700,065      |
| Administrative expenses.....                                  | 1,573,600     | 1,573,600     | 1,285,020    |
| Total services.....   | 24,167,405    | 23,710,773    | 2,973,340    |
| Funds transferred to UNRRA:                                   |               |               |              |
| United States share of UNRRA's administrative expenses.....   | 7,000,000     | 7,000,000     | 7,000,000    |
| Emergency revolving fund.....                                 | 3,300,000     | 3,300,000     | 3,300,000    |
| Chinese training program.....                                 | 145,000       | 145,000       | 145,000      |
| Overseas working fund.....                                    | 250,000       | 250,000       | 250,000      |
| United national clothing collection fund.....                 | 350,000       | 350,000       | 350,000      |
| Administrative expense adjustment fund.....                   | 6,418,500     | 6,418,500     | 6,418,500    |
| Handling and accessorial services fund.....                   | 750,000       | 750,000       | 750,000      |
| Currency fund to finance purchases outside United States..... | 75,000,000    | 75,000,000    | 75,000,000   |
| Canning program fund.....                                     | 50,000        | 50,000        | 50,000       |
| Total funds transferred.....                                  | 93,263,500    | 93,263,500    | 93,263,500   |
| Grand total.....  | 775,521,005   | 648,529,546   | 197,827,796  |

Further detail on contributions by each member government appears in table 9.

## UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTION TO UNRRA

By joint resolution of Congress, March 28, 1944, a contribution of not more than \$1,350,000,000 was authorized as the United States share toward the work of UNRRA, representing approximately 1 percent of our total national income during the base year. This resolution provided that funds appropriated pursuant to it were to be expended under the direction of the President.

On June 30, 1944, Congress appropriated an initial \$450,000,000 toward UNRRA operations—UNRRA Participation Appropriation Act—and authorized transfer of an additional \$350,000,000 in supplies, services, and funds available for disposition or expenditure under the Lend-Lease Act, provided that the state of war permitted the utilization of these items for UNRRA purposes, and provided that the FEA Administrator approved the transactions.

On June 27, 1945, the items represented by this \$350,000,000 were declared available to UNRRA without prejudice to military plans (letter to FEA Administrator from Admiral William D. Leahy, acting for the Joint Chiefs of Staff). The FEA Administrator thereupon directed use of \$100,000,000 of lend-lease funds for procurement of commodities, supplies, and services for UNRRA. A portion of the remainder of the authorized \$350,000,000 was designated for the purchase of supplies originally procured for lend-lease purposes, but now in the surplus stocks of United States agencies.

TABLE 8.—Allocations, obligations, and expenditures of funds from United States appropriation for UNRRA

|                     | Allocations  | Obligations | Expenditures |
|---------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| Cumulative to:      |              |             |              |
| Sept. 30, 1944..... | \$79,324,900 | \$4,465,335 | \$4,253,423  |
| Dec. 31, 1944.....  | 161,165,885  | 38,306,690  | 6,173,417    |
| Mar. 31, 1945.....  | 272,213,689  | 163,077,667 | 41,141,536   |
| June 30, 1945.....  | 425,713,689  | 299,011,073 | 115,643,317  |
| Sept. 30, 1945..... | 775,521,005  | 648,529,546 | 197,827,796  |

## EXPENDITURES AGAINST CONTRIBUTED FUNDS: ALL NATIONS

By September 30, 1945, UNRRA had expended or committed over 86 percent of its available resources.

Of the \$1,268,750,254 operating contributions paid (or available on request) \$1,122,131,582 had been expended or committed for relief and rehabilitation supplies and services.

Of the \$15,415,334 available for administrative expenditures, \$11,146,216 had been expended or committed.

For all purposes, operating and administrative, UNRRA had a balance of \$150,887,790 available for commitment as of September 30.

By adding \$598,594,403 in process of appropriation, UNRRA had total resources of \$749,482,193 in prospect with which to continue its operations.

Of this approximately \$750,000,000, more than \$300,000,000 were earmarked for procurement of military surpluses.

Commitments planned for the fourth quarter of the year, based on the urgent requirements of Europe and the Far East, indicated that UNRRA's total financial resources—the \$1,882,759,991 which represented the initial contributions of the member governments—would be virtually exhausted by the end of 1945. In recognition of this fact, the UNRRA Council in August 1945 recommended that a second contribution of 1 percent of national income be made by each of the contributing nations, for the continuance of UNRRA shipments through the coming year for Europe and through the first quarter of 1947 for the Far East.

## EXPENDITURES AGAINST UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTED FUNDS

Virtually all of the \$800,000,000 appropriated by Congress by September 30, 1945, for UNRRA's operations had been made available to UNRRA by that date. This amount was almost double the \$425,000,000 allocated 3 months earlier. (See table 8.) Of the \$775,000,000 allocated, \$726,000,000, or 94 percent, was for supplies; \$8,000,000, or 1 percent, for services; and \$41,000,000, or 5 percent, for ocean freight and other purposes.



TABLE 9.—Status of contributions by member governments as of Sept. 30, 1945

[In United States dollar equivalents]

| Government                          | Total         | Operating contributions      |                            | Administrative contributions |             |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------|
|                                     |               | Paid or available on request | In process of contribution | *Paid                        | Due in 1945 |
| Australia                           | 38,400,000    | 38,137,500                   | 0                          | 262,500                      | 0           |
| Belgium                             | 175,000       | (1)                          | (1)                        | 175,000                      | 0           |
| Bolivia                             | 95,238        | 25,913                       | 51,825                     | 5,833                        | 11,667      |
| Brazil                              | 30,000,000    | 9,737,500                    | 20,000,000                 | 262,500                      | 0           |
| Canada                              | 69,369,369    | 68,844,369                   | 0                          | 525,000                      | 0           |
| Chile                               | 2,153,312     | 0                            | 2,118,312                  | 0                            | 35,000      |
| China                               | 875,000       | (1)                          | (1)                        | 875,000                      | 0           |
| Colombia                            | 2,356,493     | 0                            | 2,303,993                  | 52,001                       | 499         |
| Costa Rica                          | 400,000       | 0                            | 391,250                    | 0                            | 8,750       |
| Cuba                                | 35,000        | 0                            | 0                          | 35,000                       | 0           |
| Czechoslovakia                      | 175,000       | (1)                          | (1)                        | 100,000                      | 75,000      |
| Denmark                             | 18,750        | (1)                          | (1)                        | 0                            | 18,750      |
| Dominican Republic                  | 350,000       | 236,250                      | 105,000                    | 8,750                        | 0           |
| Ecuador                             | 150,000       | 0                            | 141,250                    | 0                            | 8,750       |
| Egypt                               | 4,255,833     | 0                            | 4,133,333                  | 70,000                       | 52,500      |
| El Salvador                         | 128,750       | 0                            | 120,000                    | 5,000                        | 3,750       |
| Ethiopia                            | 8,750         | (1)                          | (1)                        | 8,750                        | 0           |
| France                              | 700,000       | (1)                          | (1)                        | 700,000                      | 0           |
| Greece                              | 87,500        | (1)                          | (1)                        | 87,500                       | 0           |
| Guatemala                           | 8,750         | 0                            | 0                          | 8,750                        | 0           |
| Haiti                               | 48,750        | 40,000                       | 0                          | 8,750                        | 0           |
| Honduras                            | 58,750        | 50,000                       | 0                          | 8,750                        | 0           |
| Iceland                             | 717,975       | 709,225                      | 0                          | 8,750                        | 0           |
| India                               | 24,042,072    | 23,342,072                   | 0                          | 700,000                      | 0           |
| Iran                                | 17,500        | 0                            | 0                          | 0                            | 17,500      |
| Iraq                                | 17,500        | 0                            | 0                          | 17,500                       | 0           |
| Liberia                             | 8,750         | 0                            | 0                          | 8,750                        | 0           |
| Luxembourg                          | 8,750         | (1)                          | (1)                        | 8,750                        | 0           |
| Mexico                              | 3,601,500     | 1,078,000                    | 2,401,000                  | 70,000                       | 52,500      |
| Netherlands                         | 262,500       | (1)                          | (1)                        | 262,500                      | 0           |
| New Zealand                         | 8,476,600     | 8,423,500                    | 0                          | 52,500                       | 0           |
| Nicaragua                           | 128,750       | 0                            | 120,000                    | 5,000                        | 3,750       |
| Norway                              | 52,500        | (1)                          | (1)                        | 52,500                       | 0           |
| Panama                              | 408,750       | 133,333                      | 266,667                    | 8,750                        | 0           |
| Paraguay                            | 38,449        | 9,500                        | 19,799                     | 0                            | 8,750       |
| Peru                                | 1,000,000     | 767,692                      | 188,558                    | 25,000                       | 18,750      |
| Philippines                         | 8,750         | (1)                          | (1)                        | 8,750                        | 0           |
| Poland                              | 175,000       | (1)                          | (1)                        | 100,000                      | 75,000      |
| Union of South Africa               | 18,135,000    | 3,955,000                    | 14,005,000                 | 175,000                      | 0           |
| Union of Soviet Socialist Republics | 1,750,000     | (1)                          | (1)                        | 1,000,000                    | 750,000     |
| United Kingdom                      | 322,400,000   | 319,775,000                  | 0                          | 2,625,000                    | 0           |
| United States of America            | 1,350,000,000 | 793,000,000                  | 550,000,000                | 7,000,000                    | 0           |
| Uruguay                             | 520,000       | 485,000                      | 0                          | 0                            | 35,000      |
| Venezuela                           | 1,017,500     | 0                            | 1,000,000                  | 17,500                       | 0           |
| Yugoslavia                          | 122,500       | (1)                          | (1)                        | 70,000                       | 52,500      |
| Total                               | 1,882,759,991 | 1,268,750,254                | 597,365,987                | 15,415,334                   | 1,228,416   |

\* Liberated country. The Council recommended that contributions for operations be made primarily by member governments whose home territory was not occupied by the enemy

## APPENDIX

## JOINT RESOLUTION TO ENABLE THE UNITED STATES TO PARTICIPATE IN THE WORK OF THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ORGANIZATION

*Resolved, etc.,* That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums, not to exceed \$1,250,000,000 in the aggregate, as the Congress may determine from time to time to be appropriated for participation by the United States (including contributions in funds or otherwise and all necessary expenses related thereto) in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, established by an agreement concluded by the United Nations and Associated Governments on November 9, 1943, reading as follows:

## "AGREEMENT FOR UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

"The governments or authorities whose duly authorized representatives have subscribed hereto,

"Being United Nations or being associated with the United Nations in this war,

"Being determined that immediately upon the liberation of any area by the armed forces of the United Nations or as a consequence of retreat of the enemy the population thereof shall receive aid and relief from their sufferings, food, clothing, and shelter, aid in the prevention of pestilence and in the recovery of the health of the people, and that preparation and arrangements shall be made for the return of prisoners and exiles to their homes and for assistance in the

resumption of urgently needed agricultural and industrial production and the restoration of essential services.

"Have agreed as follows:

## "ARTICLE I

"There is hereby established the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

"1. The Administration shall have power to acquire, hold, and convey property, to enter into contracts and undertake obligations, to designate or create agencies and to review the activities of agencies so created, to manage undertakings and in general to perform any legal act appropriate to its objects and purposes.

"2. Subject to the provisions of article VII, the purposes and functions of the Administration shall be as follows:

"(a) To plan, coordinate, administer, or arrange for the administration of measures for the relief of victims of war in any area under the control of any of the United Nations through the provision of food, fuel, clothing, shelter, and other basic necessities, medical and other essential services; and to facilitate in such areas, so far as necessary to the adequate provision of relief, the production and transportation of these articles and the furnishing of these services. The form of activities of the Administration within the territory of a member government wherein that government exercises administrative authority and the responsibility to be assumed by the member government for carrying out measures planned by the Ad-

ministration therein shall be determined after consultation with and with the consent of the member government.

"(b) To formulate and recommend measures for individual or joint action by any or all of the member governments for the coordination of purchasing, the use of ships and other procurement activities in the period following the cessation of hostilities, with a view to integrating the plans and activities of the Administration with the total movement of supplies, and for the purpose of achieving an equitable distribution of available supplies. The Administration may administer such coordination measures as may be authorized by the member governments concerned.

"(c) To study, formulate, and recommend for individual or joint action by any or all of the member governments measures with respect to such related matters, arising out of its experience in planning and performing the work of relief and rehabilitation, as may be proposed by any of the member governments. Such proposals shall be studied and recommendations formulated if the proposals are supported by a vote of the Council, and the recommendations shall be referred to any or all of the member governments for individual or joint action if approved by unanimous vote of the Central Committee and by vote of the Council.

## "ARTICLE II

## "Membership

"The members of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall be the governments or authorities signatory hereto and such other governments or authorities as may, upon application for membership, be admitted thereto by action of the Council. The Council may, if it desires, authorize the Central Committee to accept new members between sessions of the Council.

"Wherever the term 'member government' is used in this agreement it shall be construed to mean a member of the Administration, whether a government or an authority.

## "ARTICLE III

## "The Council

"1. Each member government shall name one representative, and such alternates as may be necessary, upon the Council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which shall be the policy-making body of the Administration. The Council shall, for each of its sessions, select one of its members to preside at the session. The Council shall determine its own rules of procedure. Unless otherwise provided by the agreement or by action of the Council, the Council shall vote by simple majority.

"2. The Council shall be convened in regular session not less than twice a year by the central committee. It may be convened in special session whenever the Central Committee shall deem necessary, and shall be convened within 30 days after request therefor by one-third of the members of the Council.

"3. The Central Committee of the Council shall consist of the representatives of China, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America, with the Director General presiding, without vote. Between sessions of the Council it shall, when necessary, make policy decisions of an emergency nature. All such decisions shall be recorded in the minutes of the Central Committee which shall be communicated promptly to each member government. Such decisions shall be open to reconsideration by the Council at any regular session or at any special session called in accordance with article III, paragraph 2. The

Central Committee shall invite the participation of the representative of any member government at those of its meetings at which action of special interest to such government is discussed. It shall invite the participation of the representative serving as chairman of the Committee on Supplies of the Council at those of its meetings at which policies affecting the provision of supplies are discussed.

"4. The Committee on Supplies of the Council shall consist of the members of the Council, or their alternates, representing those member governments likely to be principal suppliers of materials for relief and rehabilitation. The members shall be appointed by the Council, and the Council may authorize the Central Committee to make emergency appointments between sessions of the Council, such appointments to continue until the next session of the Council. The Committee on Supplies shall consider, formulate, and recommend to the Council and the Central Committee policies designed to assure the provision of required supplies. The Central Committee shall from time to time meet with the Committee on Supplies to review policy matters affecting supplies.

"5. The Committee of the Council for Europe shall consist of all the members of the Council, or their alternates, representing member governments of territories within the European area and such other members of the Council representing other governments directly concerned with the problems of relief and rehabilitation in the European area as shall be appointed by the Council; the Council may authorize the Central Committee to make these appointments in cases of emergency between sessions of the Council, such appointments to continue until the next session of the Council. The Committee of the Council for the Far East shall consist of all the members of the Council, or their alternates, representing member governments of territories within the far-eastern area and such other members of the Council representing other governments directly concerned with the problems of relief and rehabilitation in the far-eastern area as shall be appointed by the Council; the Council may authorize the Central Committee to make these appointments in cases of emergency between sessions of the Council, such appointments to continue until the next session of the Council. The regional committees shall normally meet within their respective areas. They shall consider and recommend to the Council and the Central Committee policies with respect to relief and rehabilitation within their respective areas. The Committee of the Council for Europe shall replace the Inter-Allied Committee on European Postwar Relief established in London on September 24, 1941, and the records of the latter shall be made available to the Committee for Europe.

"6. The Council shall establish such other standing regional committees as it shall consider desirable, the functions of such committees and the method of appointing their members being identical to that provided in article III, paragraph 5, with respect to the Committees of the Council for Europe and for the Far East. The Council shall also establish such other standing committees as it considers desirable to advise it, and, in intervals between sessions of the Council, to advise the Central Committee. For such standing technical committees as may be established, in respect of particular problems such as nutrition, health, agriculture, transport, repatriation, and finance, the members may be members of the Council or alternates nominated by them because of special competence in their respective fields of work. The members shall be appointed by the Council, and the Council may authorize the Central Committee to make emergency appointments between sessions of the Council, such appointments to continue until the

next session of the Council. Should a regional committee so desire, subcommittees of the standing technical committees shall be established by the technical committees in consultation with the regional committees, to advise the regional committees.

"7. The travel and other expenses of members of the Council and of members of its committees shall be borne by the governments which they represent.

"8. All reports and recommendations of committees of the Council shall be transmitted to the Director General for distribution to the Council and the Central Committee by the secretariat of the Council established under the provisions of Article IV, paragraph 4.

#### "ARTICLE IV

##### "The Director General

"1. The executive authority of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall be in the Director General, who shall be appointed by the Council on the nomination by unanimous vote of the Central Committee. The Director General may be removed by the Council on recommendation by unanimous vote of the Central Committee.

"2. The Director General shall have full power and authority for carrying out relief operations contemplated by article I, paragraph 2 (a), within the limits of available resources and the broad policies determined by the Council or its Central Committee. Immediately upon taking office he shall in conjunction with the military and other appropriate authorities of the United Nations prepare plans for the emergency relief of the civilian population in any area occupied by the armed forces of any of the United Nations, arrange for the procurement and assembly of the necessary supplies, and create or select the emergency organization required for this purpose. In arranging for the procurement, transportation, and distribution of supplies and services, he and his representatives shall consult and collaborate with the appropriate authorities of the United Nations and shall, wherever practicable, use the facilities made available by such authorities. Foreign voluntary relief agencies may not engage in activity in any area receiving relief from the Administration without the consent and unless subject to the regulation of the Director General. The powers and duties of the Director General are subject to the limitation of article VII.

"3. The Director General shall also be responsible for the organization and direction of the functions contemplated by article I, paragraphs 2 (b) and 2 (c).

"4. The Director General shall appoint such Deputy Directors General, officers, expert personnel, and staff at his headquarters and elsewhere, including field missions, as he shall find necessary, and he may delegate to them such of his powers as he may deem appropriate. The Director General, or upon his authorization the Deputy Directors General, shall supply such secretariat and other staff and facilities as he shall be required by the Council and its committees, including the regional committees and subcommittees. Such Deputy Directors General as shall be assigned special functions within a region shall attend meetings of the regional standing committee whenever possible and shall keep it advised on the progress of the relief and rehabilitation program within the region.

"5. The Director General shall make periodic reports to the Central Committee and to the Council covering the progress of the administration's activities. The reports shall be made public except for such portions as the Central Committee may consider it necessary, in the interest of the United Nations, to keep confidential; if a report affects the interests of a member government in such

a way as to render it questionable whether it should be published, such government shall have an opportunity of expressing its views on the question of publication. The Director General shall also arrange to have prepared periodic reports covering the activities of the administration within each region and he shall transmit such reports with his comments thereon to the Council, the Central Committee, and the respective regional committees.

#### "ARTICLE V

##### "Supplies and resources

"1. Insofar as its appropriate constitutional bodies shall authorize, each member government will contribute to the support of the administration in order to accomplish the purposes of article I, paragraph 2 (a). The amount and character of the contributions of each member government under this provision will be determined from time to time by its appropriate constitutional bodies. All such contributions received by the administration shall be accounted for.

"2. The supplies and resources made available by the member governments shall be kept in review in relation to prospective requirements by the Director General, who shall initiate action with the member governments with a view to assuring such additional supplies and resources as may be required.

"3. All purchases by any of the member governments, to be made outside their own territories during the war for relief or rehabilitation purposes, shall be made only after consultation with the Director General, and shall, so far as practicable, be carried out through the appropriate United Nations agency.

#### "ARTICLE VI

##### "Administrative expenses

"The Director General shall submit to the Council an annual budget, and from time to time such supplementary budgets as may be required, covering the necessary administrative expenses of the Administration. Upon approval of a budget by the Council the total amount approved shall be allocated to the member governments in proportions to be determined by the Council. Each member government undertakes, subject to the requirements of its constitutional procedure, to contribute to the Administration promptly its share of the administrative expenses so determined.

#### "ARTICLE VII

"Notwithstanding any other provision herein contained, while hostilities or other military necessities exist in any area, the Administration and its Director General shall not undertake activities therein without the consent of the military command of that area, and unless subject to such control as the command may find necessary. The determination that such hostilities or military necessities exist in any area shall be made by its military commander.

#### "ARTICLE VIII

##### "Amendment

"The provisions of this agreement may be amended as follows:

"a. Amendments involving new obligations for member governments shall require the approval of the Council by a two-thirds vote and shall take effect for each member government on acceptance by it;

"b. Amendments involving modification of article III or article IV shall take effect on adoption by the Council by a two-thirds vote, including the votes of all the members of the Central Committee;

"c. Other amendments shall take effect on adoption by the Council by a two-thirds vote.

#### "ARTICLE IX

##### "Entry into force

"This agreement shall enter into force with respect to each signatory on the date



when the agreement is signed by that signatory, unless otherwise specified by such signatory.

#### "ARTICLE X

##### "Withdrawal

"Any member government may give notice of withdrawal from the Administration at any time after the expiration of 6 months from the entry into force of the agreement for that government. Such notice shall take effect 12 months after the date of its communication to the Director General subject to the member government having met by that time all financial, supply, or other material obligations accepted or undertaken by it."

Sec. 2. Amounts appropriated under this resolution shall be expended under the direction of the President pursuant to section 1 hereof. The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures made under any such appropriations and of operations under the agreement.

Sec. 3. In the adoption of this joint resolution the Congress expresses its approval of and reliance upon the policy adopted by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration at the first session of the Council, summarized in paragraph 11 of Resolution No. 12, and reading as follows:

"11. The task of rehabilitation must not be considered as the beginning of reconstruction—it is coterminous with relief. No new construction or reconstruction work is contemplated, but only rehabilitation as defined in the preamble of the agreement. Problems such as unemployment are important, but not determining factors. They are consequences and, at the same time, motives of action. The Administration cannot be called upon to help restore continuous employment in the world."

Sec. 4. In expressing its approval of this joint resolution, it is the recommendation of Congress that insofar as funds and facilities permit, any area (except within enemy territory and while occupied by the enemy) important to the military operations of the United Nations which is stricken by famine or disease may be included in the benefits to be made available through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Sec. 5. No amendment under article VIII (a) of the agreement involving any new obligation for the United States shall be binding upon the United States without approval by joint resolution of Congress.

Sec. 6. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:

That in the case of the United States the appropriate constitutional body to determine the amount and character and time of the contributions of the United States is the Congress of the United States.

Sec. 7. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:

That it is understood that the provision in paragraph 11 of Resolution No. 12 adopted at the first session of the Council, referred to in section 3 of this joint resolution, and reading, "The task of rehabilitation must not be considered as the beginning of reconstruction—it is coterminous with relief," contemplates that rehabilitation means and is confined only to such activities as are necessary to relief.

Sec. 8. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:

That the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall not be authorized to enter into contracts or undertake or incur obligations beyond the limits of appropriations made under this authorization and by other countries and receipts from other sources.

Sec. 9. The authorization contained in this joint resolution shall expire on June 30, 1946.

Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 28, 1944.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on February 7, 1946, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 480. An act to authorize the sale of the allotment of Henry Keiser on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.;

S. 815. An act for the relief of Ogden & Dougherty, and for other purposes;

S. 831. An act for the relief of James Alves Saucier;

S. 845. An act for the relief of Mabel Fowler;

S. 905. An act for the relief of Harold E. Bullock;

S. 991. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Marion M. Hill;

S. 1077. An act for the relief of Oscar S. Reed;

S. 1081. An act for the relief of Aftab Ali;

S. 1142. An act for the relief of Florence Barrows;

S. 1158. An act for the relief of Winter Bros. Co.;

S. 1231. An act for the relief of Paul E. Tacy;

S. 1294. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Allan F. Walker;

S. 1296. An act for the relief of John A. Hatcher;

S. 1323. An act for the relief of the estate of William Carl Jones;

S. 1338. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Wayne Edward Wilson, a minor;

S. 1360. An act to compensate Benali El Oukili Boucheta, an inhabitant of French Morocco, for the wrongful death of his son Mohamed Ben Boucheta Ben Ali El Oukili, near Marina, Algeria, on September 30, 1944;

S. 1361. An act to compensate Clement Euziere, an inhabitant of French Morocco, for personal injuries caused by a naval vehicle near Oran, Algeria, on September 21, 1943;

S. 1448. An act for the relief of William Wilson Wurster; and

S. 1590. An act to authorize the President to appoint Graves Blanchard Erskine, major general, United States Marine Corps, to the office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, without affecting his service status and perquisites.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### CERTAIN FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the National Park Service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

#### AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the availability for certain necessary administrative expenses of appropriations for the Department of the Interior (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

#### CERTAIN FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF THE BUREAU OF MINES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of

the Bureau of Mines (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

#### PROTECTION OF FORESTS AGAINST DESTRUCTIVE INSECTS AND DISEASES

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the protection of forests against destructive insects and diseases, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### DANVERS SHOE CO., INC., v. THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and recommendations concerning the claim of the *Danvers Shoe Co., Inc., v. the United States* (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Claims.

#### REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE IN UNITED STATES COURTS

A letter from the Director of the Administrative Office in the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for that office for the fiscal year 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

#### PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from the Veterans' Cooperative Housing Association, Washington, D. C., signed by William A. Roberts, counsel, praying for the enactment of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 132) clarifying the Surplus Property Act in regard to sale of defense housing for veterans, which with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### THE WHEAT AND BREAD PROBLEM

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a very interesting statement in the form of a telegram from Mr. M. W. Thatcher, president of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, with respect to the problem of the wheat market at the present time.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., February 4, 1946.  
The Honorable JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,  
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,  
United States House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.  
The Honorable ELMER THOMAS,  
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture  
and Forestry, United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.:

There is a wheat problem, but not one that calls for bread rationing or for use of more wheat in flour, which admittedly would be a coarser and darker flour. Based on the United States Department of Agriculture's

figures of January 1, 1946, we had 689,000,000 bushels of wheat on hand. A new wheat crop will pour into market after July 1. Present indications are for at least 700,000,000 bushels of winter wheat. There will be a heavy spring wheat acreage.

Allowing for a January disappearance of 89,000,000 bushels, we will need up to July 1st no more than 200,000,000 bushels for flour and 50,000,000 bushels for spring wheat seedling and miscellaneous farm use. This would leave 350,000,000 bushels of present stocks for export, carry-over, and livestock feeding. It would be better to stop feeding wheat than to ask flour mills and bakeries and consumers to adapt themselves to a new product, with all the changes necessary to make a straight run of flour, using 85 percent of the wheat, instead of the normal 72 percent. The public and the processors would resist these far-reaching changes.

Farmers will move the wheat to town and sell it if they are given parity treatment. Farmers know that Congress is in doubt about extending the OPA price control law. That makes farmers doubt that it is wise to sell wheat under present ceilings. Farmers know that on July 1 there will be a big increase in wheat prices, if Congress does not extend the OPA law for another year.

Farmers have the same intelligence as business people, who have been and are withholding merchandise for the much higher prices which they hope will be realized either through dropping of OPA or through making exceptions, as for example in the steel industry. Farmers also know that with wage levels in the process of rising, eventually such increases will be reflected in a new and higher parity price, which under law will force the OPA to lift present ceilings on all farm prices.

From the standpoint of price, the farmer sees about every advantage in not marketing wheat now. He is not going to succumb alone to any patriotic call when he sees the United States Steel Corp. and General Motors Corp. and others getting away with theirs.

The farmer feels that all he has to do is wait.

Another point: the farmer is accustomed to carrying an inventory of wheat on his farm. It is his ever-normal granary and his base money supply. Not for patriotism alone does he intend to market this year both his present inventory and also his new wheat crop. He would then be compelled to pay a 2-year or double income tax.

In brief, he is not a fool. He intends to be treated as well as other groups in the economy of the Nation, even if he is the most patriotic. He as much as any other person wants to see wheat shipped to the starving people in other parts of the world.

But the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives cannot honestly urge its wheat-producing members to market their wheat so long as the wheat farmer is at a disadvantage as regards ceilings and double taxation.

If the farmer knew now what wheat ceiling prices would be until July 1, 1947, and if he could be relieved of double taxation from marketing two crops in the same year, and if he could be assured that he would not be subject to a third tax by the repeal of laws protecting his marketing cooperatives—as advocated by the National Tax Equality Association—then we would be on sound ground to ring the bell of patriotism and save the starving families abroad.

Further, if all these economic disadvantages were corrected, there is still a transportation break-down, not only from lack of boxcars, but from disorganization on the railroads. Now the movement of cars just from the Dakotas to Minnesota frequently takes weeks.

We want to emphasize that you can get wheat from export, without upsetting the operations of flour mills and bakeries or

changing the food habits of consumers, if you act now on these three problems:

First. Give us boxcars and transportation facilities that will work and move the wheat.

Second. Decide now, one way or the other, on the future of OPA and price ceilings for 1946-47.

Third. Protect the farmer against double and triple taxation.

If and when these three needs are met, the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives and the general farm organizations will advise farmers to move their wheat off the farms.

People all over the Nation are now questioning the political integrity and economic sense of both the Congress and the administration. This problem of wheat is not in the hands of the millers or the bakers or the farmers. It is in the hands of the Congress and the administration.

We have called a meeting of our grain cooperatives in Chicago on February 8 and 9, and have called officials from the United States Department of Agriculture to confer with us. We also are inviting through this wire the chairmen of the House and Senate Committees on Agriculture to be with us in Chicago.

Our National Federation of Grain Cooperatives is comprised of the regional grain cooperatives from Ohio to the Pacific Northwest, and from the Canadian border to the Gulf of Mexico. Its annual handle of grain is close to 400,000,000 bushels a year. Most of the farmers who own these cooperatives also are members of the Farm Bureau, the Farmers Union, or the Grange. Thus you can rest assured that you can have the solid mobilized support of agriculture to move the wheat that is needed if the Congress and the administration will just move first.

Respectfully submitted.

M. W. THATCHER,  
President, National Federation  
of Grain Cooperatives.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I was about to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram received from Mr. M. W. Thatcher, president of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, dealing with the proposition of our having black bread, and having to do with the wheat situation in general. Inasmuch, however, as the Senator from Kansas has presented and had printed in the RECORD the identical telegram, I shall not ask that it be duplicated in the RECORD, but I do ask unanimous consent to have printed a telegram from Mr. R. M. Stangler, general manager of the North Dakota Mill and Elevator, dealing with the question covered in the telegram from Mr. Thatcher.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.,  
February 4, 1946.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,  
United States Senator,  
Washington, D. C.:

Have information through Northwestern Miller that there is a possibility an order will be issued by Secretary of Agriculture in effect ordering mills to make dark flour for public consumption figured on percentage basis to the effect that 51 pounds flour would be ground out of 60 pounds wheat, which naturally necessitates grinding millfeed into the flour. This is one way to reduce the use of bread when normally speaking there generally is far more wheat in the country than can properly be used. It certainly would be a blow to the grain farmers of this country. From the information I can gather I am told

that we have exported too much wheat and flour to the extent some countries have far more than they can properly use. I might refer to England, who, I understand, has over 6 months' supply of wheat and flour on hand at this time. Asking the mills to grind black or dark flour putting in millfeed naturally reduces the feed supply when there is a shortage of feed as it is. Surely such an order should not be issued before the mills, through a committee, could be heard. It does not seem reasonable we should get to the point of rationing bread and then tell the people they must eat black bread. That in itself will have a tendency to reduce the consumption of bread that will take years to rebuild. It is a detriment to the wheat grower. Speaking for myself I think it is the most ridiculous thing I have heard for a long time. I think the details on the exporting of wheat should be investigated. This same wire going to each of our Congressmen and Senators.

R. M. STANGLER,  
General Manager, North Dakota  
Mill and Elevator.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I, too, have received a telegram from Mr. Thatcher, president of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, which seems to be identical with the one inserted in the RECORD by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]. I shall not ask, therefore, that it be again printed, but I desire to read a portion of the telegram:

There is a wheat problem, but not one that calls for bread rationing or for use of whole wheat in flour, which admittedly would be a coarser and darker flour. Based on the United States Department of Agriculture's figures of January 1, 1946, we had 689,000,000 bushels of wheat on hand. A new wheat crop will pour into market after July 1. Present indications are for at least 700,000,000 bushels of winter wheat.

#### REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1811. A bill to amend Public Law 277, Seventy-ninth Congress, so as to provide the Coast Guard, at such time as it is transferred back to the Treasury Department, with a system of laws for the settlement of claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1812. A bill to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of explosions at the Naval Ammunition Depot, Hastings, Nebr., on April 6, 1944, and September 15, 1944; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1813. A bill to provide authorization for the village of Cahokia, Ill., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Cahokia, Ill., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.



By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1814. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Commerce.

(Mr. McFARLAND (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. CHAVEZ) introduced Senate bill 1815, to permit the continuation of certain premium payments with respect to copper, lead and zinc, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MAYBANK (for himself, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. REVERCOMBE, and Mr. WILSON) introduced Senate joint resolution 140, to extend in the case of the Government-owned pipe lines known as Big Inch and Little Big Inch the time during which disposition of such pipe lines is prohibited under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

#### CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN PREMIUM PAYMENTS ON COPPER, LEAD, AND ZINC

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]; my colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]; the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]; the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]; the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK]; the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR]; the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]; the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]; and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to permit the continuation of certain premium payments with respect to copper, lead, and zinc.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1815) to permit the continuation of certain premium payments with respect to copper, lead, and zinc, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in connection with the bill just introduced I wish to make it plain that I have at all times insisted that a fair and proper price should have been placed upon copper, lead, and zinc. I believe that should be done now. But if the present prices are to be maintained, then it is absolutely necessary that the premiums upon these metals be continued, if we are to have an adequate supply of them for reconversion and are to continue to provide jobs for returning veterans.

I do not want to take the time of the Senator at this hour to make a speech upon this subject, so I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement in support of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

1. The metals situation for reconversion purposes is still very tight, especially as regards copper and lead.

(a) This is shown by the fact that we have just contracted for 120,000 tons of South American copper during the next 6 months.

(b) England has tied up Rhodesian and Canadian copper. When reconversion in Europe gets into full swing there may be

strong competition for South American copper that would raise the world price to the point where we either would have to raise ceilings or subsidize imports.

(c) It is estimated that there will be a minimum shortage of 150,000 tons of lead in the world picture.

(d) England has just raised her lead price one-half cent above our OPA ceilings to funnel foreign lead to the British Isles instead of the United States, making it imperative that we either raise the lead ceiling or subsidize imports. OPA so far has refused to raise the ceiling.

2. It is clear that we need every pound of copper, zinc, and lead that can be produced in the United States.

3. The premium-price plan is an important factor in carrying out a conservation program of mining out marginal ores developed during the war which might be lost if mines had to be abandoned due to lack of market for high-cost ores.

4. The premium-price plan stands on its own feet regardless of whether or not present ceilings are retained, raised, or removed.

(a) If ceilings are retained without premiums, the largest part of the tri-State lead-zinc properties and many of those located elsewhere will shut down, as well as practically all of the copper mines, except for a few of the largest.

(b) If ceilings were raised somewhat, say, copper to 14 cents a pound (which most people think would be the figure on a free market); lead, 9 cents a pound; and zinc, 10 cents a pound, the premium price plan still would be necessary to keep hundreds of marginal mines operating. However, payments under the plan would be reduced to perhaps 40 percent of the present amount. In effect, the part of the cost would be passed along to the public and part carried by the Government.

(c) If all ceilings were removed and prices sought their own level, continued operation of the premium price plan would cost the Government very little should fairly high prices prevail (and current shortages indicate that good prices would prevail) but still would permit marginal mines to get out what ore they have developed, and, in fact, develop more, which would be a conservation measure as we are going to have to utilize lower-grade ores.

5. Certainly we can now use all the copper, lead, and zinc we can produce. Every pound we get here is that much we will not have to import.

6. Government statements by Bureau of Mines officials relating to potential exhaustion of certain minerals are based only on known commercial reserves. Not only can present ore bodies be additionally developed but the use of ore at present noncommercial will greatly expand the potential of our mineral production, just as new discoveries will extend these horizons indefinitely. Ore reserves are increased by active operations, development, and discovery, and true conservation is not accomplished by abandoning active mining. Premiums have resulted in opening literally thousands of small and marginal operations (and some large ones, such as Castle Dome) which could not have been operated without the premium price plan, and many of which may have to discontinue without it.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 4908. An act to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5400. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit 11 amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 101) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, and request that they may be printed and lie on the table. I also ask unanimous consent that they may be considered as read under the rule and that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the amendments submitted by Mr. McCLELLAN were received, read, ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and printed in the Record, as follows:

On page 1, line 7, after the word "ancestry", insert a comma and the following: "or by reason of their affiliation with or membership in or lack of affiliation with or membership in a labor union."

On page 2, line 9, after the word "ancestry", insert "or because of affiliation with or membership in or lack of affiliation with or membership in a labor union."

On page 2, line 17, after the word "ancestry", insert "or because of such person's affiliation with or membership in or lack of affiliation with or membership in any labor union."

On page 2, line 20, after the word "ancestry", insert "or because of such person's affiliation with or membership in or lack of affiliation with or membership in any labor union."

On page 2, line 24, after the word "ancestry", insert "or because of such person's affiliation with or membership in or lack of affiliation with or membership in any labor union."

On page 3, line 5, after the word "ancestry", insert "or to confine or limit such recruitment or hiring to persons who are affiliated with or members of any labor union."

On page 3, line 10, after the word "ancestry", insert "or to interfere with, limit, or restrict the employment of any person by any employer because such person is affiliated with or is a member of or is not affiliated with or not a member of any labor union."

On page 3, line 13, after the word "ancestry", insert "or to expel any person from membership for the purpose of preventing or interfering with his employment by any employer because such person is not affiliated with or not a member of any labor union."

On page 3, line 16, after the word "ancestry", insert "or to discriminate against any employee because of his affiliation with or membership in or lack of affiliation with or membership in any labor union."

On page 3, line 22, after the word "act", insert "or because he is affiliated with or a member of or is not affiliated with or not a member of any labor union."

On page 12, line 20, after the word "ancestry", insert "or because of affiliation with or membership in or lack of affiliation with or membership in any labor union."

#### PRINTING OF COPIES OF CERTAIN HEARINGS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con.

Res. 52), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 3,000 additional copies of the summary of hearings, index to hearings, and parts 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the hearings held before the said joint committee during the first session, Seventy-ninth Congress, relative to the organization of Congress.

#### LOCATION OF PERMANENT HEADQUARTERS OF UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution, which reads as follows:

Whereas numerous objections have been made to the location of the permanent headquarters of the United Nations Organization in the Stamford-Greenwich area presently under consideration by such Organization; and

Whereas among the grounds for objection to such site is the excessive cost to the Organization of acquiring the necessary land in such area; and

Whereas publicly owned land which could be utilized at no cost to the Organization is available within the International Peace Garden situated between the State of North Dakota and the Province of Manitoba: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That it is the sense of the Congress that a site within the International Peace Garden situated between the State of North Dakota and the Province of Manitoba be designated as the permanent headquarters of the United Nations Organization; and be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be sent to the appropriate authorities of the United Nations Organization for their consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from North Dakota, will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 53), submitted by Mr. LANGER, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### ALLEGED REAL ESTATE SPECULATION NEAR PROPOSED SITE OF UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION HEADQUARTERS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution which reads as follows:

*Resolved,* That a special committee composed of five Senators to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to alleged speculation in real estate situated at or near the proposed permanent site of the United Nations Organization with a view to ascertaining (1) whether options on such property were obtained prior to selection of such site, (2) the identity of the person or persons engaged in such activities, and particularly, whether or not such persons are citizens of the United States, (3) whether such person or persons are acting as agents for a foreign or international syndicate, (4) whether any such persons have acted in violation of the laws of the United States, or whether additional legislation is necessary with respect to such activities. The commit-

tee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$ , shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from North Dakota will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 227), submitted by Mr. LANGER, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### INVESTIGATION OF CAUSES OF PENDING AND THREATENED LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. TUNNELL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MEAD, and Mr. LA FOLLETTE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 228), which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

Whereas the Nation is now faced with widespread labor-management disputes and the prospect of further dispute which vitally affect all aspects of the economy and the vital interests of the general public; and

Whereas it is essential for any continued peaceful and free labor-management relations to examine the basic causes of labor-management disputes and the basic economic and other factors, including governmental policies and decisions, affecting free collective bargaining; Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That the Committee on Education and Labor is authorized and directed to make an investigation into the causes of current and threatened labor disputes, the economic and other factors and governmental policies affecting such disputes. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions and recesses of the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress; to employ and to call upon the executive departments for clerical and other assistants; to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

#### RELIEF WHEAT COMMITMENT FOR EUROPE—ARTICLE BY CHRISTINE SADLER

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I call attention to an article in the Washing-

ton Post, written by Christine Sadler, entitled "Relief Wheat Commitment for Europe Actually Cut." The subhead is "Food authorities consider return to meat rationing as unnecessary." The article gives a rather detailed report relative to the grain situation, and also the furnishing of food by different agencies, including UNRRA. It further discusses and gives opinions of Senators and others high in authority relative to the food situation in Europe.

I ask that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### RELIEF WHEAT COMMITMENT FOR EUROPE ACTUALLY CUT—FOOD AUTHORITIES CONSIDER RETURN TO MEAT RATIONING AS UNNECESSARY

(By Christine Sadler)

President Truman revealed at his news conference yesterday that this country has lowered its relief wheat commitments abroad for the first 6 months of this year.

This apparently contradicts the belief of Americans that they would increase relief shipments abroad by going on a dark-bread diet and cutting down on their liquor.

Food officials admitted that the amount of wheat saved by these two actions would not be considerable—nor do much to bring the Nation's livestock and feed situation into balance.

#### WILL DRAMATIZE SITUATION

They agreed, however, that it would dramatize the situation and possibly result in greater marketing of grains and live animals.

The President said the new goal of wheat shipments was 200,000,000 bushels by mid-1946. The goal formerly had been 225,000,000 bushels.

Meantime, food officials discounted any idea that a return to meat rationing would be necessary for this country to meet its current foreign relief goals.

The goals as they now stand, it was pointed out, are the same as announced several months ago for all foods except wheat.

#### NOT VIEWED AS CRUX

Feed officials admitted the wheat shortage around the world and pointed out that bread is the basis of the relief diet, but some of them frankly could not see that relief feeding was the crux of the current tightrope position in which this country finds itself in regard to livestock and feed.

UNRRA wheat commitments have lagged, but not because the wheat has all disappeared. Transportation difficulties inside this country are the No. 1 reason wheat men give for the failure to get relief wheat to UNRRA boats. Other reasons include:

Pricing: Belief that wheat prices would go higher has delayed marketing. Also grains fed to animals bring more money than grain marketed straight.

#### MILLER IS HEARD FROM

One St. Paul miller wired Senator KENNETH WHERRY, Republican, of Nebraska, this week: "Farmers are not going to sell their grain as long as the price picture is not clear. They have as much sense as industrialists."

The Government, during war years, was in a better position to change prices quickly than it is now. In other years it has changed the subsidy or price supports. Price supports now are promised for 1946—to encourage farmers to up their pig crops and to get cattle back into feed lots so the Nation could have better beef.

There's not much need asking farmers to get their cattle to market in a hurry or market their pigs at lighter weights as long as the price incentive is geared the other way. Secretary Anderson has repeatedly urged a



culling of poultry flocks and heavier animal marketing, but to not much avail.

The present approach, through dark bread and less liquor, supplies a dramatic and emotional appeal to which it is hoped the farmers will respond.

Senator WHERRY yesterday termed corn the key to the wheat situation. "There's a terrific black market in corn," he said. "Farmers are not sending it to market, but they are selling it and it is being trucked away."

Considerable amounts of wheat have been going into feeds as a result of the rapid disappearance of other grains and also the lag in marketing of other grains. Similar situations prevailed several times during the war.

Last year's wheat crop was a record one of well over a billion bushels. The winter wheat crop to date is said to look good. Goals this year are higher than ever.

On the other hand, large relief shipments have not been possible until this year and the domestic drain on wheat is heavy. The expected carry-over of 200,000,000 bushels will not materialize, officials believe, and may drop to perhaps 150,000,000 bushels. Unless there should be a failure of this year's crops, some officials believe, this carry-over has an adequate margin of safety.

As one official put it last night: "I am not arguing that we are going to have a wheat surplus, nor that there may not be strains on our supply—but I am arguing that we have done nothing yet to bring the situation into balance. And it is evident we are not even meeting our relief commitments, let alone raise them."

Meantime, Paul Willis, president of the Grocery Manufacturers of America, declared: "We feel that we are entitled to more advance information before such drastic steps as this are taken in the future. . . . No one in Washington has yet completed the elemental job of pulling together in one place all the pieces of the European food problem, let alone prescribing an over-all attack on it commensurate with the crisis involved."

Senator JOHN H. BANKHEAD, Democrat, of Alabama, said he was in favor of doing everything "we can to help prevent starvation." But, he added that he wanted "some more information."

Legislation to halt exports of grain and flour temporarily was introduced in the House by Representative EDWIN A. HALL, Republican, New York.

Director General Herbert H. Lehman of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration meanwhile appealed to the United Nations Assembly for help in relieving critical storages of grain, rice, and fats in war-devastated countries.

In a cablegram to Trygve Lie, United Nations secretary general, Lehman urged the Assembly now meeting in London to take "such action as may seem fit" to get countries to increase such exports.

He said he was making this appeal "in view of the impending disaster facing the nations liberated from the enemy."

He transmitted recommendations by the UNRRA's councils committee on supplies which asked member governments to "reconsider most urgently" their decision in removing wheat and flour from international allocation.

In documenting his assertion of inadequate supplies for the relief agency, Lehman said:

"1. Only 299,000 tons of the 3,200,000 tons of wheat needed for the first half of 1946 has been allocated to UNRRA.

"2. Only 47,800 of the 720,900 metric tons of rice requested for 1946 had been granted by the combined food boards. This represented only 26.6 percent of China's needs alone.

"3. Only 185,000 long tons, or 24.2 percent of the Administration's requirement of

765,900 long tons of fats and oils have been allocated to it.

#### MRS. ROOSEVELT'S PROPOSED VISIT TO GERMANY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a news article entitled "Mrs. Roosevelt Will Find Time to Visit Germany." She, in company with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and Frank Walker, is going to Germany, not only to visit German cities and our own soldiers in the occupied zones but also to investigate conditions there.

I ask that the article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### MRS. ROOSEVELT WILL "FIND TIME" TO VISIT GERMANY

LONDON, February 7.—Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt hopes to leave London for Germany on Monday, if the United Nations General Assembly, to which she is a delegate, has concluded its first session by then.

She said: "No matter when the Conference ends, I am definitely going to find time to visit our soldiers in Germany. I wish all the United States delegates could come and so realize conditions on the European Continent."

"In my opinion, it is most important that our Senators and Congressmen should see the true state of life today in Europe. I am very happy that Senator CONNALLY and his wife are going with me on an Army tour of Germany, and I hope that Frank Walker will be able to come, too."

#### THE MORGENTHAU PLAN FOR TREATMENT OF GERMANY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by the Associated Press entitled "Morgenthau Plan Blamed by Landon." The article is self-explanatory.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### MORGENTHAU PLAN BLAMED BY LANDON

TOPEKA, February 7.—President Truman's order to Americans for informal rationing of food is a direct result of the "cruel and inhuman Morgenthau plan for treatment of Germany," Alf M. Landon, 1936 Republican Presidential candidate, said today.

In New York, Morgenthau said: "I recommend that Mr. Landon buy a copy of my book and read it. He obviously doesn't know what he is talking about. I think his statement is vicious."

#### FEEDING OF PEOPLE OF HUNGARY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article appearing under a Budapest date line entitled "Hungary's Premier Appeals for Help in Feeding People." The article is self-explanatory.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### HUNGARY'S PREMIER APPEALS FOR HELP IN FEEDING PEOPLE

BUDAPEST, February 7.—Ferenc Nagy, new Premier of Hungary, in his first address before the national assembly today pleaded for foreign aid to feed his people and asked the

return from Germany of Hungarian assets valued at \$3,000,000,000.

Nagy said Hungary would be unable to feed its population without the help of other nations.

"Hungary always gave food to others," he said, "and this is the first time she begs for bread to maintain her people's life."

#### UNITED NATIONS' EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL CONFERENCE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address relative to the United Nations' Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Conference held in London, November 1-16, 1945, delivered by him on the program Congressional Record On the Air from New York City, December 3, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### LET'S GET OUR BEARINGS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HAWKES

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Let's Get Our Bearings," delivered by Mr. Hawkes at the Brand Names Research Foundation, New York area testimonial dinner at Hotel Astor, New York, February 5, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### SEA POWER AND ITS MEANING—ADDRESS BY ADMIRAL NIMITZ

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of sea power and its meaning, delivered by Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, USN, before the National Geographic Society in Washington on January 25, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### CITATION AWARDED B'NAI B'RITH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the remarks of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower on the occasion of the presentation of a citation awarded by the War Department to B'nai B'rith for their contribution to the morale and welfare of Army personnel; the reply of Mr. Henry Monsky, of Omaha, Nebr., national president of B'nai B'rith; and a statement entitled "B'nai B'rith serves the Army," which appear in the Appendix.]

#### THE PEOPLE'S HEALTH; A NATIONAL ASSET—ADDRESS BY WATSON B. MILLER

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The People's Health—A National Asset," delivered by Watson B. Miller, Federal Security Administrator, before the Medical Society of the County of New York, on December 17, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE PARLIAMENT OF MAN—ARTICLE BY GEORGE E. SOKOLSKY

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Parliament of Man" by George E. Sokolsky, published in the New York Sun of January 26, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### LET'S TRADE—ARTICLE BY FRANK C. WALDROP

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Let's Trade," by Frank C. Waldrop, published in the Washington Times-Herald of February 8, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### A JERSEY FARM BOY

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Jersey Farm Boy," which appears in the Appendix.]

## ALBERT CANTALUPO

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1089) for the relief of Albert Cantalupo, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. MORSE conferees on the part of the Senate.

## CATHERINE BODE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2223) for the relief of Catherine Bode, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. WILEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

## HARRIET TOWNSEND BOTTOMLEY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2267) for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. O'DANIEL, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. WHERRY conferees on the part of the Senate.

## MRS. S. P. BURTON

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2487) for the relief of Mrs. S. P. Burton, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. MORSE conferees on the part of the Senate.

## SIGURDUR JONSSON AND THOROLINA THORDARDOTTIR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 314) for the relief of Sigurdur Jonsson and Thorolina Thordardottir, which was, in line 14, after "son", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

## ESTATE OF MANUEL ROSE LIMA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1101) for the relief of the estate of Manuel Rose Lima, which was, on page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$4,000."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I was talking with another Senator when the Senator from Massachusetts rose and I did not hear his request.

Mr. WALSH. My request was that the Senate concur in the House amendment to this personal relief bill. The bill which passed the Senate fixed the compensation at \$5,000, and the House reduced it to \$4,000. My motion is to concur in the action taken by the House.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to.

## PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE RETIRED LIST OF THE REGULAR NAVY AND COAST GUARD

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 473) relating to pay and allowances of officers of the retired list of the Regular Navy and Coast Guard performing active duty in the rank of rear admiral, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That any officer of the retired list of the Navy or Coast Guard of the permanent grade or rank of rear admiral who is entitled to the pay of the lower half of that grade and who is, has been, or may be recalled to active duty and who in time of war or other national emergency served, serves, or may serve satisfactorily on active duty for a period of 2 years or more in the grade or rank of rear admiral or in a higher grade, shall be entitled when on active duty to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral of the upper half unless he is entitled under other provisions of law to higher pay and allowances, and he

shall be entitled when on inactive duty to retired pay equal to 75 percent of the pay of a rear admiral of the upper half unless he is entitled under other provisions of law to higher retired pay or allowances: *Provided*, That no back pay or allowances shall be held to have accrued under this act prior to the date of its approval.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, this bill passed the House and the Senate, but a certain amendment was attached to it in the House which should be acted on by the Committee on Naval Affairs, and I ask that the amendment be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF CERTAIN DECEASED OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN OF THE ARMED SERVICES, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives, to the bill (S. 50) to permit settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of deceased commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, without administration of estates, which were, on page 3, after line 2, to insert:

SEC. 4. The paragraph of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 750), as amended by the act of December 7, 1944 (58 Stat. 795), which related to the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army, is amended to read as follows:

"Hereafter in the settlement of the accounts of deceased officers or enlisted persons of the Army, where no demand is presented by a duly appointed legal representative of the estate, the accounting officers may allow the amount found due to the decedent's widow, widower, or legal heirs in the following order of precedence: First, to the widow or widower; second, if decedent left no widow or widower, or the widow or widower be dead at time of settlement, then to the children or their issue, per stirpes; third, if no widow, widower, or descendants, then to the father and mother in equal parts; fourth, if either the father or mother be dead, then to the one surviving; fifth, if there be no widow, widower, child, father, or mother at the date of settlement, then to the brothers and sisters and children of deceased brothers and sisters, per stirpes: *Provided*, That this act shall not be so construed as to prevent payment from the amount due the decedent's estate of funeral expenses, provided a claim therefor is presented by the person or persons who actually paid the same before settlement by the accounting officers."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to permit settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of deceased commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, without administration of estates." Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the amendments added to this bill by the House of Representatives are of such importance that I ask that they be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.



REAR ADM. EARLE W. MILLS—JOINT  
RESOLUTION REFERRED TO THE COM-  
MITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 300) to authorize the President to appoint Rear Adm. Earle W. Mills, United States Navy, to the office of Chairman and member of the United States Maritime Commission and Administrator of the War Shipping Administration without affecting his naval status and perquisites, be taken from the calendar and referred to the Committee on Commerce. That is the measure in which the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is interested.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REAR ADM. EARLE W. MILLS—JOINT  
RESOLUTION INDEFINITELY POST-  
PONED

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 130) to authorize the President to appoint Rear Adm. Earle W. Mills, United States Navy, to the office of Chairman and member of the United States Maritime Commission and Administrator of the War Shipping Administration without affecting his naval status and perquisites be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LOCATION OF PERMANENT HEADQUAR-  
TERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS ORGAN-  
IZATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me to make a 3-minute statement on a different subject?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, my attention has been called to the fact that the United Nations Organization desires to establish itself in the States of Connecticut and New York and proposes to acquire an area more than 40 square miles in extent.

I cannot imagine any possible need for such space, and I do not think our Government should agree to any such establishment. It is beyond my comprehension why anything is needed other than a site comparable to the campus of a college with adequate meeting halls and office quarters. I see no reason why those attending the organization should not find their living quarters in neighboring cities or towns.

In December Congress passed a bill giving certain privileges to international organizations and providing, in effect, that these organizations should have the same status in the United States as the embassies of foreign governments. No foreign government has ever suggested such an establishment as is now proposed. The bill which Congress passed on the assumption that there was to be an embassylike location, provides that the property and assets of international organizations shall be immune from

search, and also provides that the representatives of such organizations shall be immune from suit relating to acts performed by them in their official capacity. This is all very well as to an embassy, but if applied to a site containing 40 square miles it would seem to give a kind of extraterritorial status contrary to the intention of the law, and contrary to the necessary powers which should be retained by the United States and the States of Connecticut and New York.

Mr. President, I believe that our State Department should immediately protest and that the United Nations should make over their plans and confine their establishment to a reasonable size. Incidentally, any such plan as they propose would be tremendously expensive to the nations associated in this undertaking.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHITE. I am interested to know by what process the UNO is to acquire title to these lands and this property within the States of Connecticut and New York. Have we given to this organization the power of eminent domain?

Mr. TAFT. No; the United Nations has no power of eminent domain. And I do not think the United States would have the right to exercise any power of eminent domain and hand it over to the United Nations, which is, in effect, a foreign government. The effect of the act was to say that we would recognize that the United Nations, acting together, should have the same status as an individual foreign government. That was the effect of the act.

Mr. WHITE. Yes; but the individual foreign government has no power of condemnation in the United States.

Mr. TAFT. None whatever, and I do not think the United Nations Organization has any power of condemnation.

Mr. WHITE. I was curious to know, then, by what right or on what hope they base their assumption of the acquisition or the right to acquire this property.

Mr. TAFT. I suppose they intended to buy it. I have no knowledge of that, however. What rather concerned me was that immunity from search which we conferred might be construed to give a kind of extraterritorial status to this 40 or 50 square miles; to take it out of the control of the public officials and of the States of Connecticut and New York.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to ask the Senator if either the Federal Government or the States concerned can alienate territory of the United States and give extraterritorial rights to an organization which is not a nation, but a combination of nations that have joined together in an association for certain purposes?

Mr. TAFT. I do not quite see why an act of the Congress declaring that the United Nations Organization should be considered the same as one government should not be a valid act. I as-

sume that we could give them the same rights probably, so far as the Constitution is concerned, as we give a foreign government. That is what we intended to do. But I certainly do not feel that that should be extended to cover 40 or 50 square miles of territory.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is just the point. Extraterritorial rights are given to an embassy and its buildings in a community; but it seems to me that to acquire a large area of territory and alienate it from the jurisdiction of the United States and of the States poses an entirely different question.

Mr. TAFT. I think so, too. I urged the Senate to pass the bill, and I feel some responsibility for it; but I want to say that I do not think this kind of a set-up was in any way contemplated by the bill or by the Senate when it passed the bill.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 101) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me so I may make a point of no quorum?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for that purpose, if by so doing I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

|           |                 |               |
|-----------|-----------------|---------------|
| Alken     | Hatch           | Myers         |
| Austin    | Hawkes          | O'Daniel      |
| Bailey    | Hayden          | Overton       |
| Ball      | Hickenlooper    | Radcliffe     |
| Bankhead  | Hill            | Reed          |
| Barkley   | Hoey            | Revercomb     |
| Bilbo     | Huffman         | Robertson     |
| Bridges   | Johnson, Colo.  | Russell       |
| Briggs    | Johnston, S. C. | Saltonstall   |
| Buck      | Kilgore         | Shipstead     |
| Bushfield | Knowland        | Smith         |
| Butler    | La Follette     | Stanfill      |
| Byrd      | Langer          | Stewart       |
| Capehart  | Lucas           | Taft          |
| Capper    | McCarran        | Taylor        |
| Carville  | McClellan       | Thomas, Okla. |
| Cordon    | McFarland       | Thomas, Utah  |
| Downey    | McKellar        | Tobey         |
| Eastland  | McMahon         | Tunnell       |
| Ellender  | Magnuson        | Tydings       |
| Ferguson  | Maybank         | Walsh         |
| George    | Mead            | Wheeler       |
| Gerry     | Millikin        | Wherry        |
| Gossett   | Mitchell        | White         |
| Green     | Moore           | Wiley         |
| Guffey    | Morse           | Willis        |
| Gurney    | Murdock         | Wilson        |
| Hart      | Murray          |               |

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business as a

representative of the United States attending the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, now being held in London.

Mr. WIHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business as a representative of the United States attending the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, now being held in London.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] has been excused and is absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] has been excused and is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

#### EXTENSION OF TIME DURING WHICH DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN PIPE LINES IS PROHIBITED

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield if thereby I do not lose the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I send to the desk a joint resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. The joint resolution concerns several pipe lines upon which the Surplus Property Subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs has been working. The joint resolution is introduced by me on behalf of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], and myself. We ask for a 30-day extension of the time during which disposition of certain pipe lines is prohibited under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, because several companies have taken exception to the report and wish to be heard.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 140) to extend in the case of the Government-owned pipe lines known as Big Inch and Little Big Inch the time during which disposition of such pipe lines is prohibited under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, was read, as follows:

*Resolved, etc., That subsection (c) of section 19 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by inserting after the word "facilities" the following: "and in the case of the Government-owned pipe lines known as Big Inch and Little Big Inch, extending from Texas to the New York-New Jersey area."*

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Carolina a question. As I understand the joint resolution, it would have the effect of extending, for a period of 30 days, the expiration date in connection with the report from the Surplus Prop-

erty Administration having to do with the disposition of the two pipe lines mentioned in the joint resolution.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to read to the Senate the report submitted unanimously by all the members of the committee:

The purpose of this resolution is to give the subcommittee an additional 30 days, until March 15, to consider the recommendations contained in the report.

That is all.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I cannot yield for the purpose of having this matter taken up if there is to be debate on the subject. It seems to me that the joint resolution should go over until we may know what it is all about.

Mr. MURDOCK. The only point I wish to clear up is that the joint resolution has nothing whatever to do with the disposition of high-octane gasoline plants.

Mr. MAYBANK. Nothing whatsoever. It merely gives us 30 days more to hold hearings so that we may be more enlightened.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like some further information on this question if we are to take it up at this time. What is the necessity for the joint resolution?

Mr. MAYBANK. Under the Surplus Property Act, no disposition may be made of pipe lines, among other properties, until 30 days after the submission of a report by the Surplus Property Administration setting forth disposal policies. In the case of the so-called Big Inch and Little Big Inch pipe lines, such report was submitted on January 4. Under the provisions of the Surplus Property Act the time would expire on February 13, next Wednesday, 30 days after Congress convened. The purpose of the joint resolution is merely to give the subcommittee an additional 30 days until March 15, to consider the recommendations contained in the report.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I should like to ask another question.

Mr. WHITE. I should like to have this matter go over until I have an opportunity to talk with some of the minority members of the committee. It is all new to me. I know nothing about it, and I have had no opportunity to discuss the question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to state to the distinguished Senator from Maine that the coauthors of the bill who are minority members are the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

Would the Senator from Maine object to my bringing up the resolution later this afternoon?

Mr. WHITE. I should not object if I have an opportunity to talk to the minority members, unless I find them in disagreement with the Senator from South Carolina.

I suggest that the request be deferred now, and renewed later in the afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard to the request for present consideration of the resolution.

The resolution (S. J. Res. 140) was read twice by its title and ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MAYBANK subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 140. Earlier today I asked unanimous consent for consideration of the joint resolution, but objection was made. Since then I have conferred with both the majority and minority leaders and understand that they have no objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have the calendar number of the joint resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is not on the calendar. It was introduced earlier today. The title will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 140) to extend in the case of the Government-owned pipe lines known as Big Inch and Little Big Inch the time during which disposition of such pipe lines is prohibited under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, earlier in the day I voiced objection to immediate consideration of the joint resolution. I have since spoken to minority members of the Military Affairs Committee. I find some measure of approval from individual members, but I am able to say that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has gone over this matter with his usual care and he assures me there can be no reasonable objection to acceptance of the proposal.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, with what does the joint resolution deal?

Mr. MAYBANK. The joint resolution would extend for 30 days longer the time during which disposition may be made of the Big Inch and Little Big Inch pipe lines. The time expires next week. This would give opportunity for further hearings before the subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. TAFT. It is not a legislative measure?

Mr. MAYBANK. It is a joint resolution prohibiting the sale of the pipe lines until the hearings can be completed.

Mr. TAFT. The sale of the pipe lines is now prohibited by law?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. So the joint resolution would actually prohibit for 30 days longer the sale of these pipe lines?

Mr. MAYBANK. It would extend the time, as was done in the case of aluminum sales, until the committee could finish its hearings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 140) to extend in the case of the Government-owned pipe lines known as Big Inch and Little



Big Inch the time during which disposition of such pipe lines is prohibited under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That subsection (c) of section 19 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by inserting after the word "facilities" the following: "and in the case of the Government-owned pipe lines known as Big Inch and Little Big Inch, extending from Texas to the New York-New Jersey area."

#### TREATY OF PEACE SIGNED BY UNITED KINGDOM AND INDIA WITH SIAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a photostat from the New York Times of Wednesday, January 2, 1946, giving the text of a treaty of peace signed by the United Kingdom and India with Siam. I wish to say that when the subcommittee of the Mead committee, of which I was a member, were overseas we obtained some information on the matter which I felt affected the sovereignty of Siam, prohibiting Siam from building a canal across her own territory. Upon our return, I requested a copy of the treaty from the State Department. The State Department had no copies for distribution, but referred me to the New York Times, from which I was able to obtain the full text of the treaty, which was published in that newspaper. At a later date I shall have something to say regarding this matter.

There being no objection, the treaty was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### TEXT OF TREATY OF PEACE SIGNED BY UNITED KINGDOM AND INDIA WITH SIAM

Whereas by a proclamation made in Bangkok on the 16th August 1945, the Regent of Siam did, in the name of His Majesty the King of Siam, proclaim the declaration of war made by Siam on the 25th January 1942 against the United Kingdom to be null and void in that it was made contrary to the will of the Siamese people and in violation of the constitution and laws of Siam; and

Whereas the proclamation of the 16th August 1945 aforesaid was the same day unanimously approved by the National Assembly of Siam; and

Whereas the Siamese Government have repudiated the alliance entered into by Siam with Japan on the 21st December 1941, together with all other treaties, pacts, or agreements concluded between Siam and Japan; and

Whereas the Siamese Government are anxious to play their full part in mitigating the effects of war, particularly in such measures as may be designed to assist in the restoration of international security and general economic welfare; and

Whereas the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of India, in consideration of the acts of repudiation already carried out by the Siamese Government, and not unmindful of the services rendered by the resistance movement in Siam during the war with Japan, desire to bring the state of war to an immediate end;

Now therefore the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of India on the one hand and the Siamese Gov-

ernment on the other, being desirous of renewing the relations of close friendship which existed before the war, have resolved to conclude an agreement for these purposes and have accordingly appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: Mr. M. E. Denning, CMG, OBE.

The Government of India: Mr. M. S. Aney. The Siamese Government: His Serene Highness Prince Vihat Anajai Jayant.

Who, having communicated their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

#### RESTITUTION AND READJUSTMENT

##### Article I

The Siamese Government agree to repudiate all measures pursuant to the above-mentioned declaration of war made on the 25th January 1942, and to take the necessary legislative and administrative measures to give effect to that repudiation.

##### Article II

The Siamese Government declare as null and void all purported acquisitions of British territory made by Siam later than December 7, 1941, as well as all titles, rights, properties and interests acquired in such territory since that date either by the Siamese state or by Siamese subjects. The Siamese Government agree to take the necessary legislative measures to give effect to the foregoing declaration and in particular:

(A) To repeal and declare null and void ab initio all legislative and administrative measures relating to the purported annexation by, or incorporation in, Siam of British territories effected after the 7th December 1941.

(B) To withdraw as may be required by the competent civil or military authority all Siamese military personnel from all such British territories and all Siamese officials and nationals who enter these territories after their purported annexation by, or incorporation in, Siam.

(C) To restore all property taken away from these territories, including currency except to the extent to which it can be established that fair value has been given in exchange.

(D) To compensate for loss or damage to property, rights, and interests in these territories arising out of the occupation of these territories by Siam.

(E) To redeem in sterling out of former sterling reserves current Siamese notes collected by the British authorities in British territory occupied by Siam since the 7th of December 1941.

##### Article III

The Siamese Government agree to assume responsibility for safeguarding, maintaining, and restoring unimpaired British property, rights, and interests of all kinds in Siam and for payment of compensation for losses or damage sustained. The term "property, rights, and interests" shall include inter alia the official property of the Government of the United Kingdom and of the Government of India, property whose ownership has been transferred since the outbreak of war, pensions granted to British nationals, stocks of tin, teak, and other commodities, shipping and wharves, and tin, teak, and other leases and concessions granted to British firms and individuals prior to the 7th of December 1941, and still valid at that date.

##### Article IV

The Siamese Government agree to desist from British banking and commercial concerns and permit them to resume business.

##### Article V

The Siamese Government agree to accept liability, with the addition of interest, at an appropriate percentage, in respect of payments in arrears, for the service of the loans

and for the payment of pensions in full since the date when regular payments ceased.

#### SECURITY

##### Article VI

The Siamese Government recognize that the course of events in the war with Japan demonstrates the importance of Siam to the defense of Malaya, Burma, India, and Indo-China, and the security of the Indian Ocean and Southwest Pacific areas and the Siamese Government agree to collaborate fully in all international security arrangements approved by the United Nations Organization or its Security Council which may be pertinent to Siam and especially such international security arrangements as may relate to those countries and areas.

##### Article VII

The Siamese Government undertake that no canal linking the Indian Ocean and the Gulf of Siam shall be put across Siamese territory without the prior concurrence of the Government of the United Kingdom.

#### COMMERCE AND ECONOMIC COLLABORATION

##### Article VIII

The Siamese Government agree to take all possible measures to reestablish import and export trade between Siam on the one hand and neighboring British territories on the other, and to adopt and maintain a good neighborly policy in regard to coastal shipping.

##### Article IX

The Siamese Government undertake to negotiate with the Government of the United Kingdom as soon as practicable a new treaty of establishment, commerce, and navigation and a consular convention based on the reciprocal application of the principles in article XI below.

##### Article X

The Siamese Government undertake to negotiate with the Government of India as soon as practicable a new treaty of commerce and navigation based on the reciprocal application of the principles in the following article.

##### Article XI

(1) Pending the conclusion of the treaties and convention referred to in articles IX and X above and subject to paragraph 2 of this article, the Siamese Government undertake to observe the provisions of the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation signed at Bangkok on the 23d of November 1937, and further undertake, except where the treaty specifically authorizes such action, not to enforce any measures, excluding British commercial or industrial interests or British professional men on grounds of nationality from participation in Siam economy and trade, or any measures requiring them to maintain stocks or reserves in excess of normal commercial, shipping, industrial, or business practice.

(2) The above-mentioned undertakings of the Siamese Government (A) shall be subject to such exceptions, if any, as may at any time be agreed between the Government of the United Kingdom or the Government of India, as the case may be, and the Siamese Government; (B) shall, unless prolonged by agreement, lapse if the treaties and conventions referred to in articles IX and X have not been concluded within a period of 3 years from the coming into force of this agreement.

(3) Nothing in this article shall be deemed to preclude the grant of equally favorable treatment to nationals and enterprises of any or all of the other United Nations.

##### Article XII

The Siamese Government undertake to participate in any general international arrangement regarding tin or rubber which conforms with such principles regarding commodity arrangements as may be agreed

by the United Nations Organization or its Economic and Social Council.

#### Article XIII

Until a date or dates not later than September 1, 1947, the Siamese Government undertake to prohibit, except in accordance with the recommendations of the combined boards in Washington, or any successor body, and in the case of rice, under the direction of a special organization to be set up for the purpose, any exports of rice, tin, rubber, and tea and to regulate trade in and stimulate the production of these commodities.

#### Article XIV

The Siamese Government undertake to make available free of cost at Bangkok to an organization to be indicated by the government of the United Kingdom, and as quickly as may be compatible with the retention of supplies adequate for Siamese internal needs, a quantity of rice equal to the accumulated surplus rice at present existing in Siam, subject to a maximum of one and a half million tons, or, if so agreed, the equivalent quantity of paddy or loonzain. It is agreed that the exact amount of rice to be made available under this article shall be determined by the organization above mentioned and that the rice, paddy, or loonzain delivered under this article shall conform to agreed standards of quality to be determined by the same authorities.

#### Article XV

Until a date not later than the 1st of September 1947, the Siamese Government agree to make available to the rice organization mentioned in article XIII and XIV, all rice surplus to the internal needs of Siam. Such rice, with the exception of rice delivered free in accordance with the undertaking given in article XIV, will be supplied in such manner as the special organization mentioned in articles XIII and XIV shall indicate and at prices fixed in agreement with it, having regard to the controlled prices of rice in other Asiatic rice exporting areas.

#### CIVIL AVIATION

##### Article XVI

The Siamese Government shall accord to civil air services of the British Commonwealth of Nations by means of agreements to be negotiated with governments of the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations treatment in regard to the establishment, maintenance, and operation of regular air services not less favorable than that accorded to Imperial Airways by the notes exchanged at Bangkok on the 3d of December 1937.

#### WAR GRAVES

##### Article XVII

The Siamese Government undertake to enter into an agreement with the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of India for the mutual upkeep of war graves with a view to the permanent establishment and future care of British and Indian war graves and of Siamese war graves in their respective territories.

#### MISCELLANEOUS

##### Article XVIII

The Siamese Government agree to regard as in force such bilateral treaties between the United Kingdom and Siam and India and Siam as may respectively be specified by the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of India, subject to any modifications the Government of the United Kingdom or the Government of India may indicate and to regard as abrogated such treaties not so specified.

##### Article XIX

The Siamese Government agree to regard as being in force between the United Kingdom and Siam and between India and Siam all multilateral treaties, conventions, or

agreements concluded prior to the 7th of December 1941, (A) to which Siam and the United Kingdom or India, as the case may be, were then and still are parties; (B) to which the United Kingdom or India, as the case may be, was then and still is a party, but to which Siam has not become a party.

On receipt of such notification, the Siamese Government shall immediately take the necessary steps, in accordance with the provisions of any such treaty, convention, or agreement to which Siam is not a contracting party, to accede thereto, or, if accession is not possible, shall give effect to the provisions thereto, in respect of the United Kingdom or India, as the case may be, by such legislative or administrative means as may be appropriate. The Siamese Government agree also to accept any modifications thereto which may have come into effect in accordance with the terms of such instruments since that date.

##### Article XX

Pending admission to any international organization set up since the 7th of December 1941, being an organization of which the United Kingdom or India is a member, the Siamese Government agree to carry out any obligations arising out of or in connection with any such organization or the instrument constituting it as may at any time be specified by the Government of the United Kingdom or the Government of India, as the case may be.

##### Article XXI

In consideration of the above undertaking made by the Siamese Government, the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of India agree to regard the state of war as terminated and to proceed at once to the resumption of normal relations with Siam and to the exchange of diplomatic representatives.

##### Article XXII

The Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of India also undertake to support Siam's candidature for membership of the United Nations.

#### DEFINITIONS AND DATE OF ENTRY INTO FORCE OF AGREEMENT

##### Article XXIII

It is agreed by the contracting parties that the terms "British" in this agreement, (1) when applied to physical persons, shall mean all the subjects of His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British Dominions Beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, and all persons under His Majesty's protection; (2) when applied to territory, shall mean any territory under His Majesty's sovereignty, suzerainty, protection, or mandate, as the case may be; (3) when applied to legal persons, shall mean all legal persons deriving their status as such from the law in force in any such territory; and (4) when applied to property, rights, or interests, shall mean the property, rights, or interests of persons specified under (1) or (3) above, as the case may be.

##### Article XXIV

This agreement shall enter into force as from today's date.

In witness whereof the undersigned have signed the present agreement and have affixed thereto their seals.

Done in triplicate at Singapore this 1st day of January, in the nine hundred and forty-sixth year of the Christian era, corresponding to the twenty-four hundred and eighty-ninth year of the Buddhist era in the English and Siamese languages, of which, in case of dispute, the English shall prevail.

#### RATES AND FREQUENCIES OF OVERSEAS AIR COMMERCE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I occupy the floor through the courtesy of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLEN-

DER], and without in any way interfering with his right to the floor. I wish to have that understood.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is so understood.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this week will see the conclusion of a conference between representatives of the British Government and representatives of our own Government, with representatives of the three American air lines operating in international air commerce present as observers. This conference began on January 15. Although originally expected to continue for only a week or 10 days, it has continued for more than 3 weeks. Among the important matters which have been considered at this conference are rates and fares for international air transportation and frequency of flights in such transportation.

Part of the background for this conference is a rate war in air transportation across the Atlantic. I assume that most Senators are generally familiar with this background; but as a basis for better understanding of the situation by all of us, let me sketch it briefly.

The Civil Aeronautics Board, in deciding the North Atlantic route case, granted certificates to three American air carriers for flights across the Atlantic. The three carriers are Pan-American Airways, American Air Lines, and Transcontinental and Western Air. The Civil Aeronautics Board based its action largely on the premise that competition between a number of American-flag air carriers was necessary in the public interest, in order to promote better service and lower fares.

In taking the action which it took, the Civil Aeronautics Board disregarded warnings by Members of this body, and by others, that such a policy would permit foreign nations to play off one American air carrier against another, to the detriment of the best interests of this country, and to the benefit of the interests of foreign nations. Evidence that these warnings should not have been so lightly disregarded was not long in coming.

Pan-American Airways, which previously had announced its goal as 10-hour flights across the Atlantic at a fare of approximately \$100 a passenger one way, took the first postwar step toward that goal by announcing a one-way fare of \$275 from the United States to England. Great Britain, whose own air carrier presumably had determined that it could not fly the Atlantic profitably at such a fare, promptly retaliated by refusing to permit Pan-American Airways' planes to land in the British Isles on more than the two flights a week which were guaranteed by treaty. The additional scheduled flights which had been allotted to Pan-American Airways were then offered by the British to American Air Lines, competitor of Pan-American Airways on the North Atlantic route, which had kept its fares in line with British ideas of what they should be. Under this pressure, Pan-American Airways was forced to increase its proposed fare from \$275 to \$375, and thereby charge the traveling public \$100 more than it thought necessary for a one-way flight across the Atlantic.



Remember, now, one of the avowed purposes of the Civil Aeronautics Board in granting certificates to several carriers for the North Atlantic flights was to improve service and reduce rates. Yet the very first result from this policy is that American air travelers are forced to pay \$100 more for the North Atlantic flight than they would be charged if Pan-American Airways had been permitted to put into effect its originally announced rate of \$275.

Just before the Bermuda Conference began, Pan-American Airways announced its intention to resume clipper service to France on February 15, and announced that its fare to Marseilles would be \$295. A day or so later, dispatches from Paris said the French Government would refuse to permit Pan-American Airways to fly to France with such low fares, and had demanded that transatlantic fares be made subject to international agreement.

One of the purposes of the conference now under way in Bermuda was admittedly to arrive at some form of international agreement, on a bilateral basis, between the United States and Great Britain for control of fares and frequencies. The conference has, in fact, reached such an agreement, according to newspaper reports, and has submitted it to London and Washington for approval.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not a fact that the fare which is charged by the Pan-American lines from New York or Washington to Shannon, Ireland, is \$275 and not \$375?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So the charge of an extra \$100 for the short distance from Shannon, Ireland, to an airport near London is because of the attitude of the British Government.

Mr. McCARRAN. In order to land in England, an air passenger must pay a fare of \$375, but he can land in Ireland for a fare of \$275.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I invite also the Senator's attention to the instruction which the pilot received on a recent flight which I made on a TWA Constellation to Paris. When we left Paris there was some question as to whether we would be able to land at Shannon, Ireland. The instruction given to the pilot was that the alternate port would be Brussels, Belgium. If we could not land in Ireland we would be compelled to land in Belgium.

Mr. McCARRAN. May I ask where the Senator landed?

Mr. ROBERTSON. We managed to land in Ireland.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, it seems to me that this Conference and its purposes, so far as I have outlined them, are in sharp conflict with the basic assumptions of our own Government departments. Those departments have asserted time and time again that they want free and open competition; that they are opposed to any form of cartel arrangement.

I will not take the time of the Senate to document that statement in too great detail. However, I should like to quote

from a few of our responsible officials on this subject.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, in one breath some of the departments of the Government are denouncing cartels and shouting about them from one end of the country to the other. In the next breath they are promoting cartels.

Mr. McCARRAN. They are not only promoting them but they are forcing them.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; the Senator is correct. They are not only promoting them but they are forcing them. That statement is not only true with reference to air transportation but it is also true with reference to radio and other matters.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator. In a report to the Senate Committee on Commerce, with reference to my bill for the creation of an all-American flag line, Mr. Oswald Ryan, then Acting Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, said:

The stimulus to an imaginative management that results from the competitive efforts of business rivals to secure patronage and trade cannot be matched as a motivating force for public welfare even by the private profit incentive; for the latter might be gratified by moderate traffic at high rates, while the public welfare requires a large volume at lower fares and charges.

Let me repeat:

Public welfare requires a large volume at lower fares and charges.

I do not see how that statement jibes with the actions of the Civil Aeronautics Board in standing by and condoning British coercion of an American air carrier to tack an extra \$100 on its announced fare for trans-Atlantic flight; or the further action of the Board in entering upon the Bermuda Conference with a view to perpetuating the higher rate thus arrived at.

Mr. W. L. Clayton, in testifying for the State Department before the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Senate Committee on Commerce, said:

It has been suggested that foreign air lines will provide all the competition needed to assure efficiency of operation, reasonable rates, and technical progress. In my opinion, competition with foreign air lines is not sufficient to stimulate the keen and aggressive development and improvement of services which would be forced upon an American air line by competition from another air line of the same nationality.

Today, Mr. President, we have the report that representatives of the State Department, in Bermuda, have assented to British demands for a typical cartel-type, rate-fixing agreement which will not only prevent competition between American air lines but will also prevent American air lines from competing with the British, so far as rates are concerned.

Now let me quote further from Mr. Clayton's testimony. He said:

Between the two World Wars the movement throughout the world in the direction of restrictive practices in international economic affairs, such as trade discriminations of all kinds, and cartels, etc., was very strong. The policy of the Department of State is opposed to all such restrictive practices, and we are trying to bring about, by collaboration with other nations, a movement in the opposite direction.

Mr. President, if an international agreement fixing rates for air travel across the North Atlantic at an arbitrary figure, more than 50 percent higher than the rate at which the largest, oldest, and most successful American air carrier figures it can operate profitably, is a movement in the opposite direction from restrictive practices and cartels, then I have no conception of what is meant by those terms.

In its decision in the North Atlantic route case, the Civil Aeronautics Board said:

A reduction in travel costs to the American public which Pan-American advances as an objective under its plan, of course, is earnestly desired by the Board. In our opinion, however, the objective can be reached most surely through regulated competition between United States international air carriers rather than by relying upon a worldwide monopoly. The stimulus imparted to energetic management under a sound competitive system would insure the establishment of a fare level for international service which would result in maximum development of the traffic potential.

Mr. President, we will never reach the objective of a reduction in travel costs to the American public, which the Civil Aeronautics Board in that decision said it earnestly desired, by participating in any kind of an international agreement which denies to energetic management the right to reduce fares; or which, as in this present case, actually requires that fares be increased by more than 50 percent above the level at which energetic management determined it could profitably operate.

Mr. President, not so long ago the Department of Justice spent 2 years investigating Pan-American Airways to see if it had entered into any such agreements as are now being proposed from Bermuda. The Department of Justice made that investigation with a view to taking antitrust action if it found that any such agreement had been entered into. It found no such agreements. And yet, today, there is a serious threat that exactly such an agreement will be forced upon American air carriers as a result of the Bermuda Conference.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question which came to my mind as the Senator was speaking with reference to establishing rates, and the Civil Aeronautics Board agreeing to higher rates. Under the Interstate Commerce Commission Act with reference to railroads, maximum rates are established, but I have never understood that there was anything which would prevent a railroad from charging rates under the maximum rates established, providing that it desired to do so, and providing also that it filed proper notice. Is there anything of which the Senator knows which would prevent Pan-American, or any other air carrier, from charging rates less than those which the Civil Aeronautics Board has established if the carrier so desired?

Mr. McCARRAN. I know of nothing except the illustration which I gave of a foreign country stating, in effect, "If you go under this rate you may not land on our soil."

Mr. President, what is the form of agreement which the British went to

Bermuda to get, and which, according to news reports, they have persuaded the United States delegates to recommend to Washington?

The proposal is substantially this: That our two Governments shall jointly agree to a minimum fare—probably \$375—for the North Atlantic flight, for which fare there is to be substituted, at some undetermined future time, whatever lower fare the International Air Transport Association shall determine is fair and reasonable.

Now, Mr. President, that probably sounds to many Senators like a completely innocuous proposal. The British want a temporary agreement on a fare. They say they are willing to accept any lower fare which the International Air Transport Association will approve. But there is a catch to it. The wood pile is not completely uninhabited. The International Air Transport Association, under its rules, cannot agree to a rate except by unanimous vote of its members. The British are members. Therefore, what they are saying is, in effect, that they want a rate of \$375 as a minimum, and that this rate is to continue unless, at some future time, they are willing to agree to recommend a lower rate.

That is the proposition, Mr. President. Like all proposals for action by international agreement, this one carries the basic defect that international agreement does not involve the democratic process. It is not rule of the majority.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As I understand the statement of the Senator, such an agreement would not only give Great Britain control over flights to Britain, but it would give them control of rates to all foreign countries.

Mr. McCARRAN. Practically so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is, Britain could control the rate to Ireland, to Belgium, to France, and to every other nation.

Mr. McCARRAN. She could do so indirectly, by saying, "If your rates to Ireland, Belgium, or France, are not in conformity with what we want, you cannot land in England."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; and through that pressure she could get the rates up, and once she got them up, they could not come down without her consent.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. If one nation disagrees, there is no agreement. And so we are being asked, from Bermuda, to bind ourselves to a minimum fare for trans-Atlantic flights which is not what we want, but what the British want; which is not the fare at which our most aggressive and energetic management can operate, but the fare at which the British have determined their air line can operate. We are asked to accept this fare not on a temporary basis, but on an indefinite basis; and, Mr. President, there is a world of difference. The indefinite can, in this case, become permanent for as long as the British decline to approve a lower rate.

Mr. President, the Aviation Daily of February 4 reports that delegates at the Bermuda Conference are awaiting word

from Washington and London on two principal points on which agreement was reached at the Conference. One of these points, according to the report, concerns opening American military airfields leased from the British on a 99-year basis to international commercial use. The language of the report with regard to the other point upon which, it is said, agreement has been reached, is interesting language and I wish to read it to the Senate.

Organizations of air-line operators in England and the United States will decide among themselves the rate structure and number of flights on trans-Atlantic and other inter-country flights, based on a conference formula. Their decisions will be subject to approval of the CAB in cases involving United States terminal points.

Then there is a note, which I also wish to read.

While details of the conference formula were not announced, observers took the organization to mean IATA—

That is, the International Air Transport Association—

These observers also interpreted the agreement to imply CAB approval of the IATA structure for determination of rates and frequencies—a point which stymied the January rate conference of IATA in New York.

Remember that IATA means the International Air Transport Association, and remember the rule I have cited, that there must be unanimity or no rule of that association prevails.

Mr. President, in even considering such an agreement, the State Department and the Civil Aeronautics Board are again trying to bypass the Congress and to assume authority which Congress has never delegated.

It is significant that the Civil Aeronautics Act contains no conference provision such as the Shipping Act contains. It does not provide for rate-fixing agreements by the IATA or any other form of conference, domestic or international.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 did not provide for regulation by the Civil Aeronautics Authority of the rates charged by air carriers operating in foreign air transportation. Such regulation was provided in the case of domestic air carriers, but air carriers operating in foreign air transportation were specifically left free from such regulation on the basis of the argument that in the foreign field no rate regulation was desirable, since such regulation would place American carriers at a disadvantage in competing with air carriers owned by foreign governments.

As the author of the act I may say that weeks were spent in argument of that very subject. I was happy to prevail in the thought that we should not tie the hands of our liners that would fly abroad, because I realized that they would be in competition with lines operating planes from other countries, and we had no power whatever to regulate fares or frequencies, at least fares, of lines from other countries.

The Civil Aeronautics Act specifically provided for a study of this subject by the CAA, and for a report and recommendations to the Congress based upon such a study. That study was made and

that report was transmitted. It recommended against regulation of rates in foreign air transportation.

Mr. President, the fact that the Civil Aeronautics Board has now changed its views and favors amending the Civil Aeronautics Act so as to give the Board the power to regulate these rates, does not in and of itself change the law. The Civil Aeronautics Board today has no authority to prescribe and regulate rates in international air transportation, or to approve conference or cartel agreements fixing or regulating such rates.

Neither does the Board have any authority to regulate frequencies of flights. In fact, the act specifically provides that—

No term, condition, or limitation of a certificate shall restrict the right of an air carrier to add to or change schedules, equipment, accommodations, and facilities for performing the authorized transportation and service as the development of the business and the demands of the public shall require.

I have quoted the exact language of the law of 1938.

Mr. President, so that Senators may have a complete understanding of this point, and may not be misled, let me point out that section 403 of the Civil Aeronautics Act permits the Civil Aeronautics Board to reject tariffs filed by air carriers in certain cases. But, Mr. President, that power to reject may be utilized only with respect to tariffs inconsistent with that section of the act, and with regulations of the Board issued thereunder. In other words, tariffs may be rejected only when they are not filed in the form required by regulations of the Authority, as in the cases when they are incomplete, or when they are improperly filed, posted, or published, or when they are otherwise incompatible with section 403 of the act.

The Board may not prescribe fares in any case, and may not reject tariffs solely because the Board considers them too high or too low.

I have stressed this point because it is important to understand that the Civil Aeronautics Board has no authority by law to prescribe or regulate rates or fares or the frequency of flights in international air transportation, or to approve any international agreement which does so.

Again departing from my prepared remarks, may I say that the law made this provision because we knew we were going into competition with the air lines of other countries, and we wanted to give a free hand to our people who flew the American flag in the air so that they might succeed, and so that the air commerce of America would not go down as did our sea commerce, time and time again, regardless of the money we appropriated to sustain it.

It must be obvious, therefore, that any purported agreement respecting minimum rates and fares, or frequency of operation, which has come out of the Bermuda Conference, is an agreement of curious invalidity, which no form or formality of approval by the CAB, or by the State Department, will cure.

Since the Civil Aeronautics Board has no authority to regulate such matters,



and since no other agency of our Government has such authority, any agreement which we enter into with a foreign nation respecting these matters is an agreement which we cannot perform. The only coercion which can be applied to American air lines to force their adherence to such an agreement, and their observance of it, will be the coercion which foreign nations may apply.

To say that any agency of our own Government can enforce such an agreement is to contend that the mere making of an agreement with a foreign government vests in the Civil Aeronautics Board or in the State Department powers which it does not by law possess.

This might be true if the agreement entered into should be a treaty obligation, for treaties become part of the supreme law of the land, and it might be argued that the Government, or some agency of the Government, must be presumed to possess the necessary powers to carry out treaty obligations.

In the case of the Bermuda Conference, however, no treaty is proposed. What is proposed is an Executive agreement. I do not believe anyone would seriously contend that an Executive agreement can confer any powers upon any agency of the Government. If such a contention should be made, I feel sure it would be vigorously resisted by most of the Members of this body. It is a well-established principle of law that an Executive agreement may only cover the exercise of powers already created and established by law.

Now, Mr. President, since it is clear that the Civil Aeronautics Board has no authority over rates, fares, and frequencies in international air transportation, it is obvious that adherence by the United States, otherwise than by treaty, to any agreement which would require the Board to exercise jurisdiction in such matters would be a fraud upon the other party to the agreement, and perhaps it is unjust to assume that the representatives of our Government in Bermuda would be a party to any such fraud. Doubtless the British are fully advised concerning the extent of the powers vested in the Civil Aeronautics Board.

But, Mr. President, if the British delegates and our own representatives at the Bermuda Conference understand that no such agreement as they are reported to have negotiated can be valid and binding, when what is the purpose of the Bermuda Conference? Is the whole thing just window dressing for an attempt to bring about, through government pressure, and by a show of authority not actually possessed, an assent by the American air carriers themselves to an agreement restraining them from making available to the American public any further benefits in the way of reduced fares? Is that the situation? If it is, what we have witnessed in Bermuda is an unholy spectacle indeed.

Mr. President, I have been ridiculed for warning, on this floor, that if we persisted in the policy enunciated by the Civil Aeronautics Board in the North Atlantic case we should eventually find ourselves either behind the eight ball of international power politics, or unwilling

participants in a shotgun wedding with foreign cartels. Mr. President, if the purpose of the representatives of our Government at the Bermuda Conference was not to negotiate for an invalid and unlawful agreement binding them to exercise authority which they do not possess, then clearly we have been witnessing the shotgun wedding of three American air carriers with a foreign cartel, and representatives of our State Department and our Civil Aeronautics Board have been helping to hold the shotgun.

Mr. President, I hope Senators will not dismiss this matter lightly on the ground that, after all, what is involved is only the question of whether the fare across the Atlantic by air shall be \$275 or \$375. Aside from the fact that very important principles are also involved, as I have tried to point out, it should also be remembered that the \$100 difference in fare relates to just one person, going one way. Remember that probably 80 percent of trans-Atlantic air travel will originate in the United States. Consider the fact that conservative estimates of the traffic on the North Atlantic air lanes predict a quarter million round trips per year. On that basis, Mr. President, this \$100 fare increase could cost the American traveling public \$40,000,000 per year.

Mr. President, it is discouraging, to say the least, to see representatives of the Government of the United States exerting their influence in aid of an agreement for the benefit of a foreign nation and in derogation of the interests of the American public.

I want to be fair, and so I will say that I have heard it said in extenuation of the weak-kneed and subservient attitude being taken by our State Department and by the Civil Aeronautics Board, that they have no other choice. I have heard it said that the British have us over a barrel because of the fact that unless we give them what they want, they can deny to American air carriers the right to land in the British Isles. I suppose the same thing could be said, and perhaps has been said, with regard to the French and their ability to prevent American air carriers from landing in France. However that may be, Mr. President, and whatever the rights of Great Britain and France may be in that regard, in the light of existing agreements and international comity, those who make that plea in extenuation overlook a basic and material fact. What they overlook is the fact that London and Paris are no longer, per se, the capitals of the world. London and Paris can become whistle stops or branch-line terminals on the international airways of the world if Great Britain and France elect to make them so.

We do not have to fly to London, or to Paris. Mr. Welch Pogue, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, has testified that 10 foreign countries are earnestly and ardently seeking the location in those countries of the terminals of United States air lines. We are in no danger of being denied access to the European Continent, or even to the British Isles. We can land in Sweden;

in Norway; in Belgium; in Ireland; in Spain; or in Italy.

It is my firm conviction that it means more to Great Britain to have United States air lines fly to London instead of to Ireland, than it means to us. Mr. President, we are being bluffed, in the best traditional British manner. We are being bluffed into a deal designed to tie the hands of American air carriers from now on. I say to the Senate we should call that bluff.

In spite of the weaknesses inherent in the present situation, fostered by the Civil Aeronautics Board, in which we are competing with ourselves as well as with foreign nations, our American-flag air lines might still have a chance to come out on top, or at least to hold their own against foreign competition, if they are given free and unhampered opportunity to pass on to the traveling public the savings which American efficiency and American know-how will make possible. But if their hands are tied, how can they possibly win?

Mr. President, the conference in Bermuda raises two points. One is the point of policy, what our national policy shall be, and who shall determine it. The other point is legality; the question of the legality or illegality of such an agreement as is now being considered at Bermuda.

It seems evident the time has arrived when the policy-making body of this Nation should have a voice in this matter. From the standpoint of sheer legality, the closest scrutiny should be given not only to the proposed Bermuda agreement, and to the implications of similar agreements to follow, but also to the attempt of agencies in the executive branch of the Government to usurp the policy-making function of the Congress with respect to international civil aviation. And with respect to our international aviation policy, the Congress should refuse longer to accept the ready-made edict of an administrative agency, or to tolerate the line-of-least-resistance reasoning of an appointed board, and should itself deal with this matter.

This is a job for the Congress, and for the Congress alone. Until the Congress has expressed itself, and has established our national policy with respect to international civil aviation, we have no such policy in the truest sense. At best, we can have only a de facto policy to be ascertained from the acts of our administrative and executive agencies and their officials. When the Congress has acted, and has established a policy, we shall know where we stand, and we shall have a yardstick to guide our dealings with foreign nations.

Mr. President, I have my own views on what our national aviation policy should be. Other Senators may have their own views. Members of the other House may view the matter in still a different light. But that is all the more reason why the Congress should act on this question, and determine it once and for all. When the Congress has established a policy, individual Members of this body, or of the other House, will be fully within their rights in working to change that policy, but not one of us would think of opposing it, while it remains the policy of the United States by

statutory enactment of the Congress. On the other hand, a Member of this body, or of the other House, is not only within his rights in opposing with all the force at his command the attempted illegal and improper exercise, by an executive agency of the Government, of powers constitutionally vested in the Congress; he is doing less than his sworn duty if he fails to oppose it.

#### FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 101) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was interested the other day in looking up a little history on the subject of filibusters, and I wish to say a few words in relation to that subject.

One of Wisconsin's great statesmen was Senator Robert M. La Follette, Sr., who, when I attended law school, fought valiantly for those great issues for which he thought he should fight. In 1908 he engaged in a 28-day filibuster against the Vreeland-Aldrich currency law, and spoke on that occasion for 18 hours continuously. Our former colleague and friend the late Senator Norris, who departed this life several years ago, and who once sat in the seat immediately in front of me, in 1914 engaged in a filibuster for approximately 31 days on a bill proposing to repeal the act exempting American vessels in the coastwise trade from the payment of tolls for passage through the Panama Canal.

When the armed-ship bill came up in 1917 it was filibustered for 23 days. Engaged in that filibuster were Senator Robert M. La Follette, Sr., of Wisconsin, Senator Norris, Senator Clapp, of Minnesota, Senator Cummins, of Iowa, and others.

Thus one could go on through the years. In 1933 the antilynching bill was under consideration. Among those who filibustered on that occasion was the present Secretary of State, then Senator Byrnes.

The point on which I wish to speak for a few moments is this: When men, because of their convictions, fight valiantly for a cause, they should not be condemned. Senators will remember the general in the Battle of the Bulge in Belgium, when Hitler's troops unexpectedly smashed our lines. He was asked to surrender or die, and he said, "Nuts!" He was fighting for a cause. When Wainwright fought until his ammunition was gone, he was fighting for a cause.

The trouble is that when great causes are at stake smoke screens are thrown up. The purpose is to befog the issue. I question no Senator's right to filibuster. I have voted for cloture. In this instance I shall vote against cloture. Why? Because in my opinion this bill is a misnomer. It is like many other high-sounding quack bills.

This is my position on the bill:

(a) I am against the bill.

(b) I am against the move to muzzle my southern colleagues who have been speaking against this bill.

I have probed the very depths of my convictions and come to these inescapable conclusions. Why?

1. BECAUSE THIS BILL IS A MISNOMER LIKE SO MANY OTHER HIGH SOUNDING NEW DEAL QUACK BILLS. IT WOULD NOT CREATE FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES BUT RATHER WOULD STIMULATE UNFAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

This bill is supposed to prevent discrimination by employers of more than six people and by unions, against any individual because of his race, creed, color, or national ancestry. Actually it would discriminate against a man simply because he was a member of a majority rather than a minority.

Let us take a simple example. Say an employer hires a white man rather than a particular colored man merely because the employer believes the particular white man is more able. The employer has no prejudice, as he ought not to have, against the colored man, but bases his decision simply on the fact that the colored man has less ability than the white man whom he is hiring. But the so-called Fair Employment Practice Commission created by this bill could step in and say: "You must fire the white man whom you have just employed. You must hire the colored man. We have been reading your mind and believe that you acted against the colored man because of prejudice." The employer could protest against this ruling of the Commission until doomsday. He would have to fight out the order in the court if he were so inclined. He would be risking fine and imprisonment if the court did not sustain him.

Can anyone call that fair? Of course not. This would be unfair to the employer. It would be unfair to the white man. It would be unfair to the colored man, because he should be considered on his own merits rather than on the basis of some special privilege because of the fact that he is a member of a minority.

I have said that this high-sounding bill is a misnomer. All that glistens is not gold; a rose by any other name smells as sweet, but a skunkweed called a rose still has an obnoxious odor. Senators will remember the old German legend of the Lorelei about which Goethe wrote. The sirens combed their golden hair on the rocks and lured sailors to destruction. Let us beware of the siren voices of those who would lure us away from our free way of life.

So when great issues are debated the question is not that of calling names. On next Tuesday I expect to speak in Louisville, Ky., in memory of a great American. He said that he noticed, in the trial of a lawsuit, that when a lawyer damned his opponent it was clear evidence that he had a damned poor case of his own.

That is the point I am getting at. The issue here is simple. Would this bill, if it were passed, do the job? I am convinced that it would not do the job. This bill would create prejudice instead of ending it. The bill is one more example of the worship of legislation as a fetish.

2. THIS BILL WOULD CREATE PREJUDICE INSTEAD OF ENDING IT

Take the instance I have just cited. The employer would be prejudiced against all colored men simply because he had been forced by the Government to hire one against his will. So, too, the white man who had been deprived of his employment unjustly, although he was more able, would be prejudiced against the colored man. Obviously, then, this bill would make for prejudice instead of ending it.

Let me make clear that I am absolutely against prejudice of any kind or form. I believe that we are all children of the same God and that we should be considered on the basis of our own individual abilities and natures rather than on the basis of what our faith is or who our fathers were or what the color of our skin is.

I have worked with my fellow citizens of all races and all creeds and colors—Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, white and black, men of every nationality. I have never judged them on any basis other than the basis I myself want to be judged by; namely, the standards of honesty, of loyalty, of industry, of ability.

I repeat, I am absolutely against prejudice, and that is why I am against this bill, because it would create prejudice.

3. THIS BILL IS ONE MORE EXAMPLE OF THE WORSHIP OF LEGISLATION AS A PANACEA

For 13 years now the people have been fooled into making a fetish of legislation. We have tried to solve every problem by legislation, and it simply cannot be done.

We cannot legislate brotherhood. That is a matter of education, of understanding, of faith.

Instead of worshipping the idol of legislation, we ought to go out in our individual lives and make a contribution to human brotherhood by our own individual thoughts and deeds.

Let me take a few moments on that point. What do I mean? The first commandment is: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me."

Men have worshiped many gods—golden calves, material success, and power. In the past 12 years one of the fetishes that has become a golden calf among our people is the fetish of legislation. Pass a law to make John Jones, a criminal, into an angel, and how far do we get? Pass a law that yonder desk shall raise wheat, and how far do we get? Pass a law that 2 times 2 equals 6, and how far do we get? Pass a law which would change any natural, physical, or chemical law, and how far do we get?

This bill, I repeat, is one more example of the worship of legislation as a panacea, making a fetish, out of legislative process.

Mr. President, as I have said, I have no prejudice against any human being of any class. I come from a State where there is little or no prejudice. In the past we have seen the days of the Ku Klux, which burned itself out. In the past few years I have seen a Government agency put fear into the minds of men.



4. THIS BILL WOULD CREATE A SUPER GESTAPO IN EVERY CORNER OF OUR LAND, A GESTAPO WHICH WOULD DESTROY THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF AMERICAN CITIZENS, WHICH WOULD DRAIN THE FEDERAL TREASURY OF NEEDED REVENUE, WHICH WOULD MAKE LIFE MISERABLE FOR COUNTLESS EMPLOYERS, WHICH WOULD BE A DANGEROUS INSTRUMENT IN THE HANDS OF SPIEFLIKE AND VICIOUS INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESS COMPETITORS

This bill would be a dangerous instrument for statism. By it, the State bureaucracy could get a stranglehold over big and little business. We know that there are many collectivists in our midst who would want to nationalize our industry. This bill would be an entering wedge for such nationalization. Surely, we have not forgotten how the bureaucratic agency known as WPA became mired deep in the muck of political activities. The same thing would probably happen to the FEPC. Such a situation must not be allowed to come to pass.

I invite attention to section 10-a of the bill which reads as follows:

The Commission is empowered to prohibit any person from engaging in any unfair employment practices. (a) Whenever it is alleged that any person has engaged in any such unfair employment practices the Commission or any referee, agent, or agency designated by the Commission which have power to issue and caused to be served upon such person a complaint stating the charges.

The bill defines unfair practices for the employer as refusing to hire or discharging any person or discriminating against any person in compensation or other terms of condition of employment on account of race, creed, color, nationality, origin, or ancestry. Cannot one see what this would lead to?

A spiteful individual having a grudge against a particular employer could go to the local gestapo. This spiteful individual could there lodge a complaint against the particular employer for allegedly practicing discrimination. This would start the whole complicated and costly legal machinery of the FEPC into motion. Who could foretell the eventual outcome? The employer might be forced into bankruptcy or into disrepute in his particular community. Yet in the long run he may be proved entirely innocent of the false charges against him.

If Senators could see the hundreds of letters which have come to my office from small businessmen in relation to OPA, they would appreciate the force of the point I am making. The letters have been written by men who during the war period have been striving to make ends meet. In some instances they have made minor mistakes, but Government agents, with no concept of the fact that they were agents and servants, have acted as though actuated by a master complex. Men have been filled with fear. They have been dragged into court and fined by the hundreds.

Senators will remember WPA. What a disintegrating influence that was upon the industry of the American citizen. We all know what it did to men who wanted to get a hold on the public faucet.

If we interpret the pending bill literally, it says, in substance, to any individual who employs six or more persons, "You must hire whom the Government

says." Would that help any group? Suppose A were not hired—call him black, white, Protestant, Jew, Catholic, or of any race—but suppose B were hired. Under the bill A would not even have to complain; anyone could file a complaint. When a complaint was filed, the machinery of government would begin to operate. Then what would happen? The employer would be summoned to appear. Suppose he had no prejudice, but suppose he were found by the Government agent to have prejudice. The bill contains no provision by which B would be taken care of. B would be let out. A would be put to work. How would the employer feel? How would you feel, Mr. President, if you were the employer?

But that is not all. What would happen to the employer who did not hire the worker whom the Government agent said he should hire? The employer could be dragged through the Federal courts. But suppose he had a competitor who wanted to put him out of business, and suppose complaints were filed repeatedly. Suppose a labor racketeer did not like the employer and kept on complaining, and suppose the agents of the Government continued to call at the employer's establishment and inspect his books, and suppose they continued to find him guilty of discrimination and continued to fine him. Mr. President, do you not see what I have in mind? In other words, this bill is not what it is called. It is not a fair employment practice bill. I am in favor of fair employment practices. Everyone knows that there is prejudice in the human breast, but no law-making body can legislate brotherhood any more than it can legislate love.

I need not discuss in detail the historical background of this matter. Never in the history of the United States, from the days of the founding fathers, was it contemplated that the Government should be able to tell an employer of six or more persons whom he should employ—except as a condition applying to a contract with the Government. Mr. President, if the Government can tell an employer of six or more persons whom he should employ, why should it not be able to dictate in the same way to an employer of only one person? If the bill is good as to those who employ six persons, why is it not good as to those who employ only one person? If the bill is passed, in a short time, it will be amended accordingly. If it could be found that that one person was incidentally engaged in interstate commerce, the employer of that person might be told whom he should employ.

I know there will be those who will say, "fascist." But that is no argument. There will be those who say that many of us are prejudiced against the Negroes. Mr. President, I have talked to the MuSo-Lit Club, here in this great city. I have never heard more beautiful language or finer expression of English. I have sat down at the table with black and with Jew. Why should I not? Am I any better than they? No.

I wish all America could get rid of prejudice and of the misrepresentation which has gone out over this great land of ours.

I wish our people—those who have telegraphed and written—would read the bill. The other night one person called me saying, "Pass the fair employment practice bill. Senator, I want you to vote for this fair employment practice bill."

I said to him, "Have you read the bill?"

"No," he said.

"And you are telling me to vote for something that you have not even read?"

"Yes," he said, "I am ashamed to say that is so. But I have heard over the radio and I have read in the columns of the newspapers that many men are against fair employment practices."

Mr. President, there is not a Member of the Senate who is against fair employment practices. But that is not the issue. The issue is, Does this bill provide for fair employment practices or, as I have said, is its title a misnomer?

5. A MOVE TO MUZZLE MY SOUTHERN COLLEAGUES WOULD BE UNTHINKABLE FOR ME BECAUSE I WOULD NOT VOTE FOR THIS BILL WHICH THEY ARE TRYING TO DEFEAT

Let me make this clear. I have voted for motions to end filibusters, the so-called cloture motions, in the past. I may vote for such cloture motions on other occasions and in respect to other bills in the future. But that is something which must be decided in each individual case. I cannot vote at this time for the cloture motion because I cannot vote for this bill.

There has been much loose talk against the filibuster as a parliamentary device. In the past the filibuster has often proven a valuable constitutional instrument for preventing the enactment of hasty, unseasoned, and ill-considered legislation. In view of all this, I must take my stand in opposition to the cloture motion and to this bill.

Mr. President, I feel that any move to muzzle debate by anyone on the floor of the Senate is unthinkable. There are many arguments pro and con. I have referred to some of the so-called greatest liberals and I have spoken of how they fought for their convictions. Is it wrong in the United States or anywhere else for men to have convictions and to fight and die for them? It was not so a few months ago on the battlefields of the world, and it will not be so again.

The Senate of the United States is made up of men, no two of whom have the same economic, political, social, racial, and geographical backgrounds. It is only natural, therefore, for these men to approach such a problem as the present one from different angles. I, who come from the Middle West, might not see the problem in the same light as would one who comes from New York City or the South. But I have to be guided by my own judgment.

This is no time to indulge in wordy warfare. Such a practice never leads to truth. Let me say that I credit every Senator with being honest. I do not question his motive or his judgment.

Please understand as I have said, that we all realize that in this great body there are no two men who have the same economic, social, political, racial, religious, and geographic backgrounds. If that be true, it manifestly follows that no two members of the Senate will take precisely

the same views on all subjects. Thank God for that, because here in the Senate we see in operation the fundamental American philosophy of the maintenance of a system of checks and balances. Under that system if there is a current running one way and if it has a tendency to go to extremes, someone checks it and sends it back in the other direction. We do not want to go away to the left; we do not want to go away to the right. We wish to preserve the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. We wish to preserve them, not so much for ourselves—because we shall have only a few years here and our voices will not long be heard—but for our children and grandchildren. We want them to have the same opportunities we have had.

Recently, I read a great book, *The Life of George Washington Carver*. No man, white or black, has done more for the South than that black man has. He infused into the economy of the South a new blood stream. When we read his book we understand how he did it. He did it by using his talents to develop new uses for the commodities already available to the South. He found hundreds of new uses for peanuts and various vegetables. He made tremendous contributions to the science of agriculture.

Likewise, we could speak of Booker T. Washington. He also made a great contribution. But a discussion of what he and other outstanding members of his race have contributed to the economy of the United States is really not relevant to this discussion. The point is, shall every employer of labor be put into a position where he can be hounded? Shall we create a government gestapo which will make life perfectly miserable for the men who produce and create and build? That is the issue.

Most of us remember the story of the old colored man who, during the depression, had no home to go to. He wandered up and down the highways and byways of the Southland. He had no place to rest his head. Mr. President, once there was a white man like that; He was called Jesus of Nazareth, and of Him it was said that He was so poor that He had no place to put his head.

This colored man roamed up and down the Southland. One day he was told, "Mose, you can go up there in that half-acre lot. There is an old shack there that you can live in." Mose went there, and he found that the shack was in very bad condition. The windows were broken, the shutters were about to fall off, the doors were falling off their hinges, and the roof was caved in. The half-acre lot was filled with stones, vines, and weeds. But Mose went to work. By the next spring, Mose had fixed up the little shack. He had put the doors back on the hinges; he had repaired the windows and the roof, and he had painted the little building. Roses were climbing over it. Out in the half-acre lot the weeds and rocks were gone. Flowers were blooming there. Just about then the old colored parson came by. He said, "Mose, you and the Lord is sure done a good job here." Mose replied, "Parson you should have seen it when the Lord had it alone."

Mr. President, that little story exemplifies a fundamental bit of America's success. That colored man, not by legislation but by work and industry, did the job. So in adherence to Christian principles, every individual recognizing that it is man's obligation not only to love his God, but to love his fellow man as well, will we find the proper solution. But when we are told from the housetops, by those who try to create schism and hatred, that the correct way is the legislative way, I have a conviction that says, "No; you cannot do it the legislative way."

It was work by Mose that eradicated the weeds; it requires work by each of us to eradicate prejudice.

#### CONCLUSION

I know, Mr. President, that my position in opposition to the FEPC will be misrepresented, that I will be denounced as having prejudice against my fellow citizens. But I hope through this statement that I may reach the minds of those fair-minded citizens who will clearly evaluate the reasons which I have presented.

May I say in conclusion that my own State of Wisconsin has considered legislation of this sort and after careful review has decided that such legislation would only serve to stimulate inequity, prejudice, and discrimination.

In the light of all this, I must take my stand in opposition to this unconstitutional, un-American, and prejudice-making bill.

The inalienable rights of American citizens have already been whittled away to a dangerous extent without any resultant good to the Nation. I cannot aid and abet that unconstitutional process. I shall do all that is within my humble power to reverse that process and restore to every American his full rights.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, just before the Senate recessed yesterday I was discussing the arrests which were made in the city of Cincinnati during the year 1938. I was attempting to show the difference between the number of arrests which were made in northern cities, and those which were made in southern cities. I presented facts which indicated that, although we in the South have a colored population which is 3 times greater than that in the North, yet the colored population of the North commit more crimes than are committed by the colored population residing in the South. I think that the comparison which I made between the cities of Washington and New Orleans should be studied in order that it may be seen that we in the South feel that we are more capable of handling the Negro problem than are the people in the North.

I now desire to continue to show the number of arrests which were made in the city of Cincinnati during the year 1939. It will be recalled that the crimes, a record of which has been made, include murder, manslaughter, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, and auto theft.

As I stated yesterday, in the city of Cincinnati the colored people constitute 11 percent and the white population 89 percent of the entire population; yet 11

percent of the colored people committed more of the crimes to which I have referred than did the 89 percent of the remaining population, or, in other words, the whites.

In the case of murder and manslaughter, the whites committed 12 such crimes during 1939 in the city of Cincinnati while the Negroes committed 36. Bear in mind, Senators, that the proportion of the population is 11 for the colored and 89 for the white. For the other crimes the figures are as follows:

Rape, whites 19, Negroes 12; robbery, whites 114, Negroes 158; aggravated assault, whites 40, Negroes 130; burglary, whites 284, Negroes 335; larceny, whites 662, Negroes 666; auto theft, whites 124, Negroes 57.

Rate per 10,000 population, whites 31, Negroes 290.

In other words, for each white man who committed a crime in the categories to which I have referred, 9.4 Negroes committed similar crimes in Cincinnati. The figures which I have given are for the year 1939, and it will be noted that the ratio as between colored and white runs pretty steadily in all the northern cities. Of course, there are some years in which the ratio is greater, just as in Cincinnati, but in most years the ratio is 1.7 to about 9 in the cities of Cincinnati and St. Louis, as I indicated yesterday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table from which I have just read printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Arrests, city of Cincinnati, 1939*

|                                 | Whites | Negroes | Total |
|---------------------------------|--------|---------|-------|
| Murder.....                     | 12     | 36      | 48    |
| Manslaughter.....               | 19     | 12      | 31    |
| Rape.....                       | 114    | 158     | 272   |
| Robbery.....                    | 40     | 130     | 170   |
| Aggravated assault.....         | 284    | 335     | 619   |
| Burglary.....                   | 662    | 666     | 1,328 |
| Larceny, theft.....             | 124    | 57      | 181   |
| Automobile theft.....           |        |         |       |
| Total.....                      | 1,255  | 1,394   | 2,649 |
| Rate per 10,000 population..... | 31     | 290     |       |

|                           |         |
|---------------------------|---------|
| Population:               |         |
| White (89 percent).....   | 403,112 |
| Colored (11 percent)..... | 47,818  |
| Total.....                | 450,930 |
| Other.....                | 230     |
| Total.....                | 451,160 |

Crime figures taken from the Annual Report of Division of Police, Department of Safety, City of Cincinnati, 1939.

Population figures taken from 1930 census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Mr. ELLENDER. I now have before me a table of the arrests made in the city of Cincinnati during the year 1940. I may state that the population ratio has changed somewhat, as indicated by the 1940 census. It will be recalled that according to the 1930 census the ratio was 89 to 11. For 1940 the whites constituted 87.8 percent of the entire population and the Negroes constituted 12.2 percent of the entire population.

In other words, there was a gain of approximately 1.2 percent. But that gain affected the ratio, it would seem,



only slightly. In examining the figures I note that the lowest ratio was 7.9.

I now read from the table of figures with reference to 1940.

Murder and manslaughter, whites 19, Negroes 33; rape, whites 25, Negroes 11; robbery, whites 95, Negroes 138; aggravated assault, whites 36, Negroes 119; burglary, whites 257, Negroes 267; larceny, whites 591, Negroes 675; auto theft, whites 98, Negroes 72.

Rate per 10,000 population, whites 16, Negroes 191.

Stated in another way, the figures show that each time a white person committed any of the crimes in the categories I have mentioned, Negroes committed 11.9 crimes, or, a ratio of almost 12 to 1.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table from which I have just read printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Arrests, city of Cincinnati, 1940*

|                                 | Whites | Negroes | Total |
|---------------------------------|--------|---------|-------|
| Murder.....                     | 19     | 33      | 52    |
| Manslaughter.....               | 25     | 11      | 36    |
| Rape.....                       | 95     | 138     | 233   |
| Robbery.....                    | 36     | 119     | 155   |
| Aggravated assault.....         | 257    | 267     | 524   |
| Burglary.....                   | 591    | 675     | 1,266 |
| Larceny, theft.....             | 98     | 72      | 170   |
| Auto theft.....                 |        |         |       |
| Total.....                      | 1,121  | 1,315   | 2,436 |
| Rate per 10,000 population..... | 16     | 191     |       |

|                             |         |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| Population:                 |         |
| White (87.8 percent).....   | 719,811 |
| Colored (12.2 percent)..... | 69,315  |
| Total.....                  | 789,126 |
| Others.....                 | 183     |
| Total.....                  | 789,309 |

Crime figures taken from the Annual Report of Division of Police, Department of Safety, City of Cincinnati, 1940.

Population figures taken from 1940 census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have some figures relating to some of the southern cities. I do not mean to say that the white people of the South commit more crimes than do the white people of the North, or vice versa, but the ratio as between the whites and the Negroes in the southern cities, such as in New Orleans, and in Houston, has been about 1 to 2.1, or more. In other words, every time a white man committed a crime in the categories which are shown in the table from which I have read, 2.5 colored men committed similar crimes, and in the North the ratio runs as high as 13.6.

I shall now proceed with the figures for Cincinnati for the year 1941:

Murder and manslaughter, whites 18, Negroes 41; rape, whites 27, Negroes 21; robbery, whites 69, Negroes 203; aggravated assault, whites 49, Negroes 139; burglary, whites 167, Negroes 211; larceny-theft, whites 557, Negroes 638; auto theft, whites 118; Negroes 57.

Total, whites, 1,005; Negroes, 1,310.

In other words, the white population, constituting 87.8 percent of the whole, and the colored 12.2 percent, committed 305 less of the crimes than did the colored people.

The rate per 10,000 was, whites 14; Negroes, 190, or a ratio of 1 white to 13.6 colored.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Arrests, city of Cincinnati, 1941*

|                         | Whites | Negroes | Total |
|-------------------------|--------|---------|-------|
| Murder.....             | 18     | 41      | 59    |
| Manslaughter.....       | 27     | 21      | 48    |
| Rape.....               | 69     | 203     | 272   |
| Robbery.....            | 49     | 139     | 188   |
| Aggravated assault..... | 167    | 211     | 378   |
| Burglary.....           | 557    | 638     | 1,195 |
| Larceny, theft.....     | 118    | 57      | 175   |
| Automobile theft.....   |        |         |       |

|                                 |       |       |       |
|---------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Rate per 10,000 population..... | 1,005 | 1,310 | 2,315 |
|                                 | 14    | 190   |       |

|                             |         |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| Population:                 |         |
| White (87.8 percent).....   | 719,811 |
| Colored (12.2 percent)..... | 69,315  |
| Total.....                  | 789,126 |
| Others.....                 | 183     |
| Total.....                  | 789,309 |

Crime figures taken from the Annual Report of Division of Police, Department of Safety, City of Cincinnati, 1941.

Population figures taken from 1940 census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, these figures are significant, and I hope the people of the country will study them. I have stated on this floor on many occasions that we of the South know how to handle the Negro. We of the South, I think, are better friends of the colored people than are the people of the North. If let alone, the progress of the colored people which we have maintained for the past 25 or 30 years will be continued. We were unable to do more because of our economic condition.

During my own lifetime I have seen gradual progress from year to year. There was a time in my State when there were no high schools for colored people, because we could not afford them, but today our whole State is dotted with them. We have several Negro colleges in the State, and we have provided for the colored by way of establishing throughout the State six fine hospitals, which are maintained by the State, and in all of them the colored people are treated to the same extent and by the same doctors as are the white people.

Mr. President, as I stated yesterday and the day before, I do not mean to say that if this bill were enacted it in itself would stop progress, but it would be a step in the wrong direction. We have been taking care of the situation in the South on a more or less voluntary basis. The bill if enacted would simply be a trouble maker, and would impede the fine progress of the white people of the South in their efforts to aid the colored people.

In my State there is no agitation among the colored people that I know of for a bill of this nature. It is brought forward by virtue of the "brain trust," as I stated, located here in Washington, composed of a few colored leaders, about 25, as I pointed out to the Senate day before yesterday.

These 25 colored leaders preach that they represent 13,000,000 of their kind.

If the truth were known, I doubt if as many as 1 percent of the colored people of the Nation know what all this is about. They are being mulcted out of fees here and there to maintain a lobby in Washington with a view of having certain legislation passed, or preventing certain legislation which may affect the colored race.

Many of my good colleagues, for whom I have much respect, are prone at times to listen to the wailing of some of the groups who are in Washington trying to agitate and threatening that unless so-and-so is done "we will remember you at the polls next November."

Mr. President, I shall continue with the figures as to arrests in the city of Cincinnati for the year 1942. I notice that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is present, and Cincinnati happens to be quite close to his State. I tried to get figures for the city of Chicago, but I could not obtain them. I am satisfied that the figures as to the city of Chicago would probably be as bad as those with reference to the city of Cincinnati, or perhaps worse.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Since the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has referred to the Senator from Illinois in speaking of certain conditions in Cincinnati, Ohio, I happen to notice the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] present in the Chamber. I think he lives in Cincinnati. If the Senator has anything he wishes to discuss with me about Chicago, I shall be glad to join in the debate with him.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope the Senator will not misunderstand me. I merely mentioned the Senator's name to show that he was present. I called the attention of the distinguished Senator from Ohio to these figures yesterday, and we had a brief colloquy at that time.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, this is a filibuster, and it would not do any harm to call his attention to the same figures again.

Mr. ELLENDER. Not at all. As a matter of fact, I notice the presence of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who has been a constant attendant, and I commend him for it. Of course, I know he appreciates the great speech I am making, and I assume that is why he is present. I also notice that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is present, as well as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLLELLAN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH].

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HATCH. It was not necessary for the Senator to call my name today to do me the favor of showing that I was present. He did that yesterday.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. Of course, I know that many of

my colleagues are unable to be present because of the huge amount of work they have before committees. I realize that.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield?  
Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I merely wanted to say to the Senator that he is disturbing the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Hatch] very much, because the Senator from New Mexico is writing a speech, and really the speech of the Senator from Louisiana is rather disturbing some serious thoughts on the part of the Senator from New Mexico. I know it will help the Senator from New Mexico to have the Senator from Louisiana conclude.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to bring up a conference report at this time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator permit me to get through with these figures? I have just a few more pages. It will take me but a few minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well.

Mr. ELLENDER. I now turn to the figures of arrests in the city of Cincinnati for the year 1942, with the population ratio the same, 87.8 percent white and 12.2 percent colored.

Murder and manslaughter, whites, 14, Negroes, 39; rape, whites, 23, Negroes, 23; robbery, whites, 72, Negroes, 162; aggravated assault, whites, 60, Negroes, 139; burglary, whites, 248, Negroes, 218; larceny-theft, whites, 539, Negroes, 534; auto theft, whites, 116, Negroes, 42.

Total: whites, 1,072; Negroes, 1,157.

Rate per 10,000 population: whites, 15, Negroes, 168; or 1 white to 11.2 colored.

I ask unanimous consent that the table be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Arrests, city of Cincinnati, 1942*

|                                 | Whites | Negroes | Total |
|---------------------------------|--------|---------|-------|
| Murder.....                     | 14     | 39      | 53    |
| Manslaughter.....               | 23     | 23      | 46    |
| Rape.....                       | 72     | 162     | 234   |
| Robbery.....                    | 60     | 139     | 199   |
| Aggravated assault.....         | 248    | 218     | 466   |
| Burglary.....                   | 539    | 534     | 1,073 |
| Larceny, theft.....             | 116    | 42      | 158   |
| Automobile theft.....           |        |         |       |
| Total.....                      | 1,072  | 1,157   | 2,229 |
| Rate per 10,000 population..... | 15     | 168     |       |

Population:  
White (87.8 percent)..... 719,811  
Colored (12.2 percent)..... 69,315

Total..... 789,126  
Others..... 183

Total..... 789,309

Crime figures taken from Annual Report of the Division of Police, Department of Safety, City of Cincinnati, 1942.

Population figures taken from 1940 census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I now turn to the figures for the city of Cincinnati for 1943.

Murder-manslaughter, whites, 19, Negroes, 30; rape, whites, 23, Negroes, 19; robbery, whites, 83, Negroes, 134; aggravated assault, whites, 72, Negroes, 119; burglary, whites, 390, Negroes, 245; lar-

ceny-theft, whites, 648, Negroes, 456; auto theft, whites, 116, Negroes, 43.

Total: Whites, 1,351; Negroes, 1,046.

Rate per 10,000 population: Whites, 19, Negroes, 151. The ratio is 7.9 Negroes to 1 white.

I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Arrests, city of Cincinnati, 1943*

|                                 | Whites | Negroes | Total |
|---------------------------------|--------|---------|-------|
| Murder.....                     | 19     | 30      | 49    |
| Manslaughter.....               | 23     | 19      | 42    |
| Rape.....                       | 83     | 134     | 217   |
| Robbery.....                    | 72     | 119     | 191   |
| Aggravated assault.....         | 390    | 245     | 635   |
| Burglary.....                   | 648    | 456     | 1,104 |
| Larceny, theft.....             | 116    | 43      | 159   |
| Automobile theft.....           |        |         |       |
| Total.....                      | 1,351  | 1,046   | 2,397 |
| Rate per 10,000 population..... | 19     | 151     |       |

Population:  
White (87.8 percent)..... 719,811  
Colored (12.2 percent)..... 69,315  
Total..... 789,126  
Others..... 183  
Total..... 789,309

Crime figures taken from Annual Report of the Division of Police, Department of Safety, City of Cincinnati, 1943.

Population figures taken from 1940 census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I may say that, as shown by the records I have which extend from 1936 to 1944, 1943 and 1944 are the only years in which the whites committed more crimes than did the Negroes; but the ratios were 7.9 colored to 1 white in 1943, as I have just indicated, and 8 colored to 1 white in 1944.

I shall now give the figures for arrests in the city of Cincinnati in 1944.

Murder and manslaughter, whites, 16, Negroes, 33; rape, whites, 40, Negroes, 24; robbery, whites, 82, Negroes, 94; aggravated assault, whites, 81, Negroes, 133; burglary, whites, 321, Negroes, 208; larceny and theft, whites, 681, Negroes, 511; auto theft, whites, 144, Negroes, 54.

Total of arrests in Cincinnati in 1944: Whites, 1,368; Negroes, 1,057.

Rate per 10,000 of population: Whites, 19; Negroes, 153; or on a ratio basis of 1 white to 8 colored.

Mr. President, I ask that the table showing the number of arrests in the city of Cincinnati in 1944 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Arrests, city of Cincinnati, 1944*

|                                 | Whites | Negroes | Total |
|---------------------------------|--------|---------|-------|
| Murder.....                     | 16     | 33      | 49    |
| Manslaughter.....               | 40     | 24      | 64    |
| Rape.....                       | 82     | 94      | 176   |
| Robbery.....                    | 81     | 133     | 214   |
| Aggravated assault.....         | 321    | 208     | 529   |
| Burglary.....                   | 681    | 511     | 1,192 |
| Larceny, theft.....             | 144    | 54      | 198   |
| Automobile theft.....           |        |         |       |
| Total.....                      | 1,368  | 1,057   | 2,425 |
| Rate per 10,000 population..... | 19     | 153     |       |

Population:  
White (87.8 percent)..... 719,811  
Colored (12.2 percent)..... 69,315  
Total..... 789,126  
Others..... 183  
Total..... 789,309

Crime figures taken from Annual Report of the Division of Police, Department of Safety, City of Cincinnati, 1942.

Population figures taken from 1940 Census (U. S. Bureau of the Census).

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, that completes the picture insofar as the city of Cincinnati is concerned. I shall continue, since the Senator from Kentucky is not at the moment present on the floor, but I wish to say that I shall gladly yield to him when he returns, if thereby I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senate majority leader is ready to proceed. If the Senator will yield to me for the purpose, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield for that purpose provided I do not thereby lose my right to the floor.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

|           |                 |               |
|-----------|-----------------|---------------|
| Aiken     | Hatch           | Myers         |
| Austin    | Hawkes          | O'Daniel      |
| Bailey    | Hayden          | Overton       |
| Ball      | Hickenlooper    | Radcliffe     |
| Bankhead  | Hill            | Reed          |
| Barkley   | Hoe             | Revercomb     |
| Bilbo     | Huffman         | Robertson     |
| Bridges   | Johnson, Colo.  | Russell       |
| Briggs    | Johnston, S. C. | Saltanstill   |
| Buck      | Kilgore         | Shipstead     |
| Bushfield | Knowland        | Smith         |
| Butler    | La Follette     | Stanfill      |
| Byrd      | Langer          | Stewart       |
| Capehart  | Lucas           | Taft          |
| Capper    | McCarran        | Taylor        |
| Carville  | McClellan       | Thomas, Okla. |
| Cordon    | McFarland       | Thomas, Utah  |
| Downey    | McKellar        | Tobey         |
| Eastland  | McMahon         | Tunnell       |
| Ellender  | Magnuson        | Tydings       |
| Ferguson  | Maybank         | Walsh         |
| George    | Mead            | Wheeler       |
| Gerry     | Millikin        | Wherry        |
| Gossett   | Mitchell        | White         |
| Green     | Moore           | Wiley         |
| Guffey    | Morse           | Willis        |
| Gurney    | Murdock         | Wilson        |
| Hart      | Murray          |               |

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

#### FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Louisiana to yield to me in order that I may submit a conference report on the full-employment legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield with the understanding that I do not thereby lose my right to the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I submit a conference report which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read.



The Chief Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment and full production in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

**"SHORT TITLE**

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'Employment Act of 1946'.

**"DECLARATION OF POLICY**

"SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

**"ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT**

"SEC. 3. (a) The President shall transmit to the Congress within sixty days after the beginning of each regular session (commencing with the year 1947) an economic report (hereinafter called the 'Economic Report') setting forth (1) the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power obtaining in the United States and such levels needed to carry out the policy declared in section 2; (2) current and foreseeable trends in the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power; (3) a review of the economic program of the Federal Government and a review of economic conditions affecting employment in the United States or any considerable portion thereof during the preceding year and of their effect upon employment, production, and purchasing power; and (4) a program for carrying out the policy declared in section 2, together with such recommendations for legislation as he may deem necessary or desirable.

"(b) The President may transmit from time to time to the Congress reports supplementary to the Economic Report, each of which shall include such supplementary or revised recommendations as he may deem necessary or desirable to achieve the policy declared in section 2.

"(c) The Economic Report, and all supplementary reports, transmitted under subsection (b), shall, when transmitted to Congress, be referred to the joint committee created by section 5.

**"COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS TO THE PRESIDENT**

"SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby created in the Executive Office of the President a Council of Economic Advisers (hereinafter called the 'Council'). The Council shall be composed of three members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and

consent of the Senate, and each of whom shall be a person who, as a result of his training, experience, and attainments, is exceptionally qualified to analyze and interpret economic developments, to appraise programs and activities of the Government in the light of the policy declared in section 2, and to formulate and recommend national economic policy to promote employment, production, and purchasing power under free competitive enterprise. Each member of the Council shall receive compensation at the rate of \$15,000 per annum. The President shall designate one of the members of the Council as chairman and one as vice chairman, who shall act as chairman in the absence of the chairman.

"(b) The Council is authorized to employ, and fix the compensation of, such specialists and other experts as may be necessary for the carrying out of its functions under this Act, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws, to employ such other officers and employees as may be necessary for carrying out its functions under this Act, and fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

"(c) It shall be the duty and function of the Council—

"(1) to assist and advise the President in the preparation of the Economic Report;

"(2) to gather timely and authoritative information concerning economic developments and economic trends, both current and prospective, to analyze and interpret such information in the light of the policy declared in section 2 for the purpose of determining whether such developments and trends are interfering, or are likely to interfere, with the achievement of such policy, and to compile and submit to the President studies relating to such developments and trends;

"(3) to appraise the various programs and activities of the Federal Government in the light of the policy declared in section 2 for the purpose of determining the extent to which such programs and activities are contributing, and the extent to which they are not contributing, to the achievement of such policy, and to make recommendations to the President with respect thereto;

"(4) to develop and recommend to the President national economic policies to foster and promote free competitive enterprise, to avoid economic fluctuations or to diminish the effects thereof, and to maintain employment, production, and purchasing power;

"(5) to make and furnish such studies, reports thereon, and recommendations with respect to matters of Federal economic policy and legislation as the President may request.

"(d) The Council shall make an annual report to the President in December of each year.

"(e) In exercising its powers, functions, and duties under this Act—

"(1) the Council may constitute such advisory committees and may consult with such representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, consumers, State and local governments, and other groups, as it deems advisable;

"(2) the Council shall, to the fullest extent possible, utilize the services, facilities, and information (including statistical information) of other Government agencies as well as of private research agencies, in order that duplication of effort and expense may be avoided.

"(f) To enable the Council to exercise its powers, functions, and duties under this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated (except for the salaries of the members and the salaries of officers and employees of the Council) such sums as may be necessary. For the salaries of the members and the salaries of officers and employees of the Council, there is authorized to be appropriated not exceeding \$345,000 in the aggregate for each fiscal year.

**"JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT**

"SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on the Economic Report, to be composed of seven Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The party representation on the joint committee shall as nearly as may be feasible reflect the relative membership of the majority and minority parties in the Senate and House of Representatives.

"(b) It shall be the function of the joint committee—

"(1) to make a continuing study of matters relating to the Economic Report;

"(2) to study means of coordinating programs in order to further the policy of this Act; and

"(3) as a guide to the several committees of the Congress dealing with legislation relating to the Economic Report, not later than May 1 of each year (beginning with the year 1947) to file a report with the Senate and the House of Representatives containing its findings and recommendations with respect to each of the main recommendations made by the President in the Economic Report, and from time to time to make such other reports and recommendations to the Senate and House of Representatives as it deems advisable.

"(c) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

"(d) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings as it deems advisable, and, within the limitations of its appropriations, the joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems necessary and advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall not exceed 25 cents per hundred words. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, and facilities of the departments and establishments of the Government, and also of private research agencies.

"(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, the sum of \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this section, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman."

And the House agree to the same.

That the title of the bill be amended to read as follows: "An Act to declare a national policy on employment, production, and purchasing power, and for other purposes."

ROBERT F. WAGNER,  
ALBEN W. BARKLEY,  
GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,  
ABE MURDOCK,  
GLEN TAYLOR,  
CHAS. W. TOBEY,  
ROBERT A. TAFT.

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

CARTER MANASCO,  
JOHN J. COCHRAN,  
WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make only a brief explanation of the conference report, which has already been agreed to by the House of Representatives, and which I am anxious to have agreed to by the Senate. As Senators are all aware, the Senate passed Senate bill 380, known as the full employment legislation, in which it declared a national policy on the question of employment, provided for the creation of a joint committee of the two Houses, and undertook to set a goal for employment, and production, and purchasing power, in order that we might never again be caught in a widespread unemployment situation without some previous effort to avert it, and to provide a method by which it could be met, if we could not avert it.

The difference in philosophy between the Senate and House bills was very marked, and it was not an easy task to resolve the differences between the two bills. The House of Representatives had in a large measure discarded the Senate bill and had written an entirely different bill. In the declaration of policy the House had restricted the area of the bill very considerably. It declared it to be the responsibility of the Federal Government to take an interest in employment, to avert unemployment, but largely to solve it by public expenditure for the construction of public works such as highways, flood control projects, river and harbor improvements, and other similar projects authorized and appropriated for by Congress.

It was not an easy matter to compose the differences between the two Houses on the question of policy. The House objected to the expression "full employment" because it carried with it the implication that every single human being in the United States, who was out of work at any given time, would be afforded employment by the Federal Government. That was never the intention of the Senate in the use of the expression "full employment" because we all know that there will always be times when there will be some unemployment. There will be frictional unemployment and transitory unemployment arising from the fact that workers are passing from one job to another. There never can be a time when every available human being will have a job. The House conferees took the position that if we used the word "full" it would carry with it an implied guaranty on the part of the Federal Government that if there were not employment for everyone at all times the Federal Government would step in and provide employment by some method to be paid for by the public.

Another question arose with respect to the use of the word "assured." When we first began to consider this legislation, as it was originally introduced the word "guarantee" was used, which carried the same implication. In the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate the word "guarantee" was changed to "assured." In the conference the word "assured" seemed to carry with it in the minds of the House conferees the same implication which was originally carried

by the word "guarantee." So the House conferees would not agree to that word. The House conferees finally became convinced that in order to arrive at an agreement on the declaration of policy we would have to go further than merely declare the obligation of the Federal Government to spend money out of its Treasury to give people work in case of an emergency. So what we did was to write what I think is a better declaration of policy than was contained in either the Senate or the House bill. We shortened it very materially. Both in the House bill and in the Senate bill there were sections and subsections, and a great deal of repetitious language meaning the same thing. We worked out a declaration of policy which I think is much more easily understood, and which accomplishes the purpose of the two Houses and of the President in recommending the legislation. It is very brief, and I shall read it:

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

So without using either the word "full" or the word "assured" we have written in the policy section language which it seems to me covers the entire scope and field within which the Federal Government might operate with all its policies, all its plans, and all its functions, in cooperation with industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments to create conditions under which maximum employment will be afforded—not only maximum employment, but maximum production and maximum purchasing power.

If we can by governmental policies create conditions under which those three things can take place, we shall have set a standard and a goal with respect to which I think no one can raise any serious objection.

The virtue of this section is that it is brief and covers the entire ground. It is free from subsections and long terminology which might be subject to misinterpretation. So I think the conferees really improved the declaration of policy, without yielding anything with respect to the obligation and responsibility of the Federal Government. The conferees have spelled out in that section what is equivalent to maximum possible employment, maximum production, and maximum purchasing power, all three of which must go together in order to afford what we have been pleased to call full employment.

The Senate bill provided, in section 3, that the President should make what was called a budgetary report to the Congress. The use of the word "budget"

made it possible to confuse the economic budget referred to in this legislation with the President's annual budget sent to Congress, upon which we base our appropriations and outline the financial requirements of the Government for the ensuing fiscal year. In that section also there was a large amount of what we found later to be unnecessary terminology. The House bill, instead of setting up a budget and requiring the President to send an economic budget to the Congress annually, or as often as he might see fit to do so, provided in section 3 for an economic report. It seemed to the Senate conferees that the use of the term "economic report," in order that it might be differentiated from and not confused with the President's annual budget message, was a better term than the term used in the Senate bill. So we have provided in section 3 for what we call an economic report from the President. We provide as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) The President shall transmit to the Congress within 60 days after the beginning of each regular session (commencing with the year 1947) an economic report (hereinafter called the "Economic Report") setting forth (1) the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power obtaining in the United States and such levels needed to carry out the policy declared in section 2; (2) current and foreseeable trends in the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power; (3) a review of the economic program of the Federal Government and a review of economic conditions affecting employment in the United States or any considerable portion thereof during the preceding year and of their effect upon employment, production, and purchasing power; and (4) a program for carrying out the policy declared in section 2, together with such recommendations for legislation as he may deem necessary or desirable.

In other words, under those categories in the third section of the conference report the President is to make an economic report to Congress, reviewing the conditions which have existed in the previous year, the trends in employment, production, and purchasing power currently, together with any prospective viewpoint with respect to employment, production, and earning capacity or purchasing power, and any recommendations he may see fit to make to Congress to carry out the policies set forth in section 2.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask if there was any discussion in the conference committee as to the interpretation to be placed upon the words "economic program of the Federal Government"? I have in mind the question of a public-works program, and I have also in mind that during the war the Federal Government really went into industry and competed with industry. I take it that the words "economic program" could not be interpreted to mean or to imply in the future, possibly, that the Federal Government would go into business and compete with industry, and that sort of thing. I judge, rather, that the activities of the Federal Government under the authority granted would be confined to public works.



Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there was considerable discussion in regard to the whole scope of what the Senate in its bill called the President's budget message, and what the House of Representatives, in its amendments, called the President's economic report. The House of Representatives in its amendments and the House conferees at the outset of the conference took the position that the Federal Government's responsibility and obligation did not go beyond actual public works of the nature I have mentioned, namely, highways, river-and-harbor developments, flood-control works, public buildings and so forth. But it was the theory of the Senate bill, which the House conferees accepted, that beyond the mere expenditure of money from the Treasury, there is a field which envisages a greater obligation on the part of the Federal Government in coordinating its policies, performing its functions and carrying out its plans, always emphasizing, as the bill does, policies which are calculated to foster and promote private industry, the competitive system which we so frequently discuss. For instance, in connection with the policy of the Government, toward trade matters, and in cooperation with labor and with agriculture, with industry, and with State and local governments, there is a responsibility more or less of a moral nature which goes beyond the mere expenditure of money out of the Treasury for public buildings, river-and-harbor projects, and similar matters. But in the conference discussion it was at no time understood that the Government of the United States, as a matter of policy under the section declaring our purpose, was to embark upon enterprises competitive with private factories, and so forth.

Of course, that could not be done anyway, unless Congress authorized it. If there should occur, as there did in 1932, 1933, and the following years, an acute depression accompanied by widespread unemployment, Congress then would have to determine what its policy would be with respect to the expenditure of money. But I do not think the Senator from Massachusetts or the Senate or the country should consider the war period as an analogy to be used and considered in connection with our effort to bring about economic conditions which will foster and promote employment to the fullest possible extent and production and purchasing power to the fullest possible extent, which is the goal of this legislation.

The Senate provided for the creation of a joint committee, to be composed of Members of the two Houses, for the purpose of considering the recommendations of the President and the reports of the Commission or Board.

The fourth section, following provision for the four categories of things on which the President would make his economic report to the Congress within 60 days from the beginning of each session of the Congress, provides for the creation of a Council of Economic Advisers to the President. In arriving at the provisions for creation of that Board, we acceded very substantially to the provisions of the House amendments. We

finally agreed that there should be created in the Executive Office of the President a Council of Economic Advisers whose duty it should be to advise the President in connection with the preparation of his economic report to the Congress, that the President should appoint the three members of the Council by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and that they should be persons who would be exceptionally qualified to analyze and interpret economic developments, to appraise the programs and activities of the Government in the light of the policy declared in section 2, and to formulate and recommend a national economic policy to promote employment, production, and purchasing power under free competitive enterprise. It is provided that the salaries of those outstanding men shall be \$15,000 a year, because as we all know the Board must have excellent men if it is to function as it is expected to function in advising the President with respect to economic conditions and trends of employment and production and purchasing power, all of which we wish to have considered together, for all through the bill we have linked the questions of employment, production, and purchasing power, which we think must go together in order to bring about the economic conditions under which competitive enterprise may give the highest possible maximum of employment, as a result of the necessity for production and purchasing power.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. I have been considerably troubled by finding at some of the committee hearings which have been held that occasionally there is great diversity between the evidence given as to levels of employment, numbers of employees, and so forth. I am interested in knowing whether the members of the economic council would be the ones to determine what were the accurate figures in such respects, so that there would be no dispute.

Mr. BARKLEY. I can say to the Senator that it was the purpose of both the House of Representatives and the Senate, after getting together and in the process of getting together, to provide for the creation of a board whose members, by reason of their character and experience and training, would be able to report to the President accurate figures with respect to employment, unemployment, and all related subjects bearing on the problem we are seeking to solve. Whether anyone or any board can be accurate down to knowing about the last man who is unemployed, I suppose none of us knows, and none of us would be so exacting as to expect that. But the Board is to be set up to advise the President regarding all the conditions upon which he is to be required within 60 days from the beginning of each session of Congress to make his economic report to the Congress. We also have provided that the reports, as well as the recommendations made to the President, may become available to the joint committee which would be set up, for its information and benefit in

determining both the facts relative to and the wisdom of any legislation or any policy which might be brought before it for consideration.

Mr. SMITH. The economic report probably would be based, would it not, on the recommendations of the council?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. I am troubled by the fact that at our hearings we have frequently found differences of opinion in regard to what are the accurate figures. There have been differences between the figures submitted by the Department of Labor and the figures submitted by various other organizations. I am wondering whether it will be possible for us to satisfy the public as to what the trends are by providing for the creation of this Commission.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is true, as the Senator from New Jersey has said, that divergent figures have been given by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor and various other organizations, through their boards and committees, and at any given time there has been a divergence of opinion as to the number of persons employed and the number of persons unemployed. We have provided for the creation of this Board and we have provided, we hope, for payment to its members of sufficient compensation to justify the employment and service of the best qualified men in the country to perform that task—to gather the facts and make the information official and to be as nearly accurate as any board composed of human beings can be.

Mr. SMITH. It would be a clearing house for such information, would it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. Undoubtedly.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Because, of course, in arriving at their figures they would consult all elements in the country—industry, labor, and all other elements, as well as Government and State agencies.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. In discussing the next provision of the conference report, let me state that the Senate may remember that, in the Senate bill, provision was made for the creation of a joint committee of 30 members, 15 of them to be selected from the Senate and 15 to be selected from the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives provided in its amendment that the persons appointed by the Speaker should be the chairmen of various committees, as set out in the House amendment.

One of our first conclusions was that a joint committee of 30 would be entirely too large, and, then, there is always a question as to the efficacy of joint committees in dealing with legislation. We have had some unfortunate experiences in the Congress with respect to the creation of joint committees dealing with many subjects. We felt that there should be a joint committee of the two Houses to function in receiving and appraising the economic reports which, from time to time, the Congress will receive from the President and, through him, from the economic board which will be created. So we agreed upon a reduction of the number of members of

the joint committee from 30 to 14—7 to be selected from each House of Congress, the members selected to be appointed by the Presiding Officer of each House. We did not designate any committees from which he would appoint them, so he will be able to make his selections from the entire membership of the House concerned. We did provide that the respective party membership of the committee members from each House should be as nearly as possible in proportion to the majority and minority representation in each House. So we have reduced the number of members of the joint committee and we have made provision that the Speaker of the House and the Presiding Officer of the Senate shall have a free hand in making appointments to the joint committee.

In the main, those are the provisions of the conference report. We have shortened the bill very materially. We have made it simpler, without eliminating anything essential to the attainment of the goal of the highest possible maximum of employment of which our country and our economic system are capable.

Mr. President, I wish to say that the conferees from both sides of the Chamber, both Democratic and Republican, represented as far as possible the attitude of the Senate. Of course, the House conferees felt that it was their duty to represent the viewpoint of the House. But we eventually came to the conclusion that in view of the different philosophies of the two bills it was necessary to make concessions on both sides in order to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. After we had discussed the matter for many days, the light began to break. The House conferees and the Senate conferees were very cooperative and very sincere in their effort to bring about legislation which would foster the highest possible employment, and link it up with production and purchasing power, all of which must go together in order to afford employment to the largest number of available persons throughout the country. So, by incorporating in section 2 of the bill the language, "for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power" we feel that we have gone as far as possible, and as far as we should be required to go in providing what may be called full employment. If there are any persons in this country who are unwilling or unable to work, this bill is not intended for them. The bill is intended for those who are willing, and able to work, and are seeking employment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I congratulate the conference committee on the job which it has done. I hope that the joint committee provided for in the conference committee's report will be as successful in performing the job assigned to it as the committee of conference has been in the task it has completed. However, that is beside the point.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the conferees I wish to thank the Senator for his generous comment.

Mr. CORDON. I note that the bill provides for a council of economic advisers to the President to consist of three members. I wonder if perhaps the conference committee had in mind the three great divisions of effort in this country, namely, agriculture, management or industry, and labor, and that perhaps it had the thought that in selecting the members of the council the President might be able to place upon it men each of whom would be well versed in one of the great divisions of effort to which I have referred. It would appear that if that were done, it would be a consummation devoutly to be wished.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the conferees discussed the very question to which the Senator has referred. Inasmuch as the council was to be within the executive department for the purpose of assisting the President in arriving at conclusions, after all the facts had been assembled on which he would base his report, it was felt that a council consisting of three members would be sufficient. We also discussed whether we should set out in the statute a provision that the President should make the appointments from three groups. We decided that if the law were to make it mandatory for the President to appoint a representative of each of the three groups, the appointees would automatically consider themselves as spokesmen and representatives of their respective groups, and that it would be more difficult for them to arrive at a consensus of opinion if they were made to believe they were acting merely as representatives of their respective groups.

Therefore, we left the President's hands free in looking over the country and in selecting men of experience and vision when making such appointments. The idea of the conferees was that in making these appointments without designating the appointees as representatives of groups, the President would choose men who would be able to speak in a broad way for all the people, and at the same time have adequate knowledge with reference to any particular segment of the population.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am in entire accord with the Senator's view that the President should not be limited in his selections. I hope, however, that the President will have in mind the three great economic divisions when he makes his selections.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, practically, these appointees would have the rank of cabinet officers.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. And while they might tend to represent one or another of the groups I should hope that they would be of such broad experience and knowledge that they would not be merely representatives of any particular group.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct, and what he has stated was the

feeling of the conferees. It was hoped that the appointees would be men of such outstanding ability and experience that they would be representing the whole country, and at the same time bring to the service of the council whatever experience they may have had in their respective callings.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am in accord with the views of the Senator from Ohio. I did not intend to convey in my brief remarks the suggestion that each of the members of the council should represent one of the great segments of effort in this country, but, rather, that it might be possible that one of them would be well versed and well informed with reference to one of the three great divisions of effort, so that the three would bring full and broad information with reference to the questions which might come before them.

Mr. BARKLEY. That was our viewpoint, and I think it was the unanimous viewpoint of the conferees on both sides.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as a member of the conference committee, and as one who has been struggling with the bill since last August, I am very glad to urge Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle to vote in favor of the conference report. I believe that if the bill had contained originally what it now contains it would have been passed by both Houses of Congress in one month. There is now nothing in the bill to which any Member of the Congress should take exception. I think the Senate conferees did the best they could do with the bill which had already been extensively modified in the Senate, but the House took the attitude, practically, that it would not make any substantial change, and that if we wanted any bill at all we had to agree substantially to this bill. So far as I was concerned, I was glad indeed to do so.

The conferences which were held by the conferees were fairly numerous. First of all, we were doubtful about the words "full employment." I voted rather reluctantly for the bill which finally passed the Senate, although it contained the words "full employment," because of the testimony of many persons who stated that although the words "full employment" were used, the bill did not mean exactly that. It was stated that always there are people who do not wish to work, and therefore "full employment" means only substantially full employment. I was willing to accept the change of language, and I did so. Therefore, there is now no full employment bill, and the bill which we now have before us allays all the fears of those who thought that the actual conditions were being misconstrued.

In the second place, the bill which passed the Senate contained the words "the right to work." From the beginning a violent controversy took place in the Senate as to whether there was such a thing as a right to work. It seemed quite obvious that under our economy there was no legal right to work. I voted for the bill in a slightly modified form, because the authors of the bill explained



that they did not mean to construe its language as a legal right to work, that that was not the meaning, and that it should not be so construed. So I took their word for it, although it seemed to me it was somewhat ambiguous, and we might be accused of fooling the people.

Those who have any doubt on that score may eliminate their doubt, because there is no right to work provided for anywhere in the conference-report bill.

The third controversy that arose, both in the committee and in the Senate, was over the word "assurance" or "guaranty" by the Government of a job. The distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] was particularly concerned about such an assurance, which he thought could not be given by the Government as a practical matter, even if it wished to do so, and it would only be misrepresenting the situation if it were claimed such assurance was given.

Anyone who has any fear on that score need not vote against the conference report on that ground, because the word "assurance" is completely eliminated from the bill, and by the bill there is no longer any assurance of any kind pinned on the Government.

The original bill contained one thing about which I was most concerned, the provision embodying the so-called compensatory spending theory, by which we would figure up the number of jobs there would be—60,000,000 jobs—and how much income would be required to provide for them—\$20,000,000,000. Then, if we found we were not going to get the money, a program was provided to make up the difference, the so-called compensatory spending theory. To some extent the Senate modified that provision by adopting my amendment proposing that if a spending plan were presented, a tax plan should be presented along with it to take care of it. It was not in very satisfactory language, but no one need be concerned any longer, because there is no provision for the compensatory spending theory, no suggestion in the bill anywhere that the Federal Government has to balance its budget to cover the difference caused by spending anywhere from five, to ten, to twenty billion dollars, as might be necessary to meet the calculations which were required by the original bill.

A national-budget idea suggested the same thought, and while I voted for the bill with the national-budget provision in it, I have some doubt as to the wisdom of the suggestion of a spending program to make up the so-called deficit in the Budget. Anyone who is concerned about that can be completely at ease, because the words "national budget" are completely eliminated from the bill, and all that is provided for in the bill is an economic report.

I do not think, either, that the Republicans on this side of the aisle need fear voting for the report because of apprehension that it might be construed as a victory for President Truman, because President Truman endorsed first the original bill containing all the provisions which have been completely eliminated.

Then in his message of September 6, he said he wanted—

A national reassertion of the right to work for every American citizen able and willing to work—a declaration of the ultimate duty of Government to use its own resources if all other methods should fail to prevent prolonged unemployment. These will help to avert fear and establish full employment. The prompt and firm acceptance of this bed-rock public responsibility will reduce the need for its exercise.

Full employment means full opportunity for all under the American economic system.

The "full employment" is eliminated, the "national reassertion of the right to work" is eliminated, and the bill does not bear any resemblance to the bill which was originally recommended.

On January 3 the President said:

A satisfactory full employment bill was passed by the Senate. Another bill was passed by the House of Representatives which is not at all acceptable, and which does not accomplish any of the purposes sought.

There is a slight variation in the conference report bill from the House bill, but it is so slight that it can hardly be recognized. So that we regretfully gave up the full employment, we regretfully gave up the right to work, we gave up the assurance, but I am afraid that the President will have to accept a bill which is substantially the House bill, which he disapproved so strongly on January 3.

So I do not think any Republican need fear voting for the bill because of any apprehension that there is a victory in the passage of the full employment bill, because there is no full employment bill any more. The bill is one which I would have supported from the beginning. It is a bill which provides in effect that the Government shall take thought and shall provide the machinery for eliminating economic depression.

We create a Commission of three, who will have the duty of studying economics, determining how the law can be carried out, and making their report, and we declare a general policy of the Government to use all its means to bring about a prosperous condition so that people looking for work may expect to find work.

As I have said, if that had been the original character of the bill, I would have supported it from the beginning, and I think we would have passed the bill immediately with whatever good effect on the morale of the country we might have expected to obtain by the passage of the bill.

For the reasons I have stated, Mr. President, I very strongly hope that the Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle will support the conference report.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a little more than a year ago, a group of Senators joined me in sponsoring legislation to commit the Federal Government to a policy of maintaining full employment in a free competitive economy. At that time, we were still engaged in all-out war against the Axis Powers—Germany, Italy, and Japan. The Normandy beach-head had already been established, and the prospects for eventual victory seemed quite certain. We were looking forward to what might happen in America following the inevitable day of victory.

During the course of the war, America had built up the greatest productive machine in history, and a period of great industrial and business expansion seemed certain to follow our expected military success.

We were confronted, however, with the disturbing record of recurring booms and depressions in our somewhat imperfect economy. We had learned that unless something could be done to influence the operations of the so-called business cycle, we would again be certain to experience a postwar boom followed by an unprecedented collapse. We knew that a repetition of the depression which followed in the wake of the last war would again bring widespread unemployment and frustration to millions of our citizens, wrecking the hopes of our veterans, and perhaps undermining faith in the capitalistic system throughout the world.

We could not agree with those who, looking ahead into the future, undertook to bolster their courage with the notion that if we maintained a nicely balanced Budget to keep business from losing confidence, Government relief and charity would see us through.

We could not agree with those who maintained that depressions were inevitable in a free society, and that without regimentation and loss of our freedoms nothing could be done to maintain continuing employment opportunities for our growing population.

It was then our conviction, Mr. President, that the welfare of American business, American farmers, American workers, and American veterans depends more than anything else upon whether or not the Federal Government shall assume the responsibility for maintaining a balanced economy and conditions of full employment in our country. Every practical businessman knows that unless the Government develops a positive and far-sighted economic program, business operating as in the past cannot by itself maintain continuous employment opportunities for workers.

During the 1920's the Government had failed to recognize its responsibilities in this respect. Instead of providing a program designed to level off the peaks and valleys in industry, commerce, and agriculture, the Government in that period, adhering to *laissez faire* principles, gave business a free rein to manage our economy. Our productive capacity during that period was expanded at a tremendous rate—with fabulous profits and high savings for a favored section of the Nation, and no attempt to maintain a general purchasing power in the hands of the people. The inevitable result was the great depression starting in 1929, which created widespread bankruptcy and destitution—all but wrecking the capitalistic system.

Mr. President, it was our conviction in sponsoring this legislation that a full employment program on the part of the Government is essential to the preservation of free enterprise. Any failure in this responsibility will be certain to threaten our system of free enterprise as well as our political system upon which it is based.

During the last depression, our economy had failed to provide for a third or more of our people. It failed to provide these people with jobs and hence failed to provide them with a livelihood. A situation was thus created in which millions of our citizens were forced to become more interested in obtaining the wherewithal for food, clothing and shelter than in maintaining the system which meant so little to them.

With all these considerations in mind, we drafted a bill designed to provide a framework within which the Federal Government at the end of the war could develop and administer a program of full employment and full production.

Upon introducing this bill on January 22, 1945, I made the following statement:

In the past, we have made many attempts to grapple with the problem of unemployment. But we have lacked the essential weapons to deal with this problem effectively. We have never had a consistent and openly arrived at national policy on employment. We have never had a businesslike method of appraising the operations of our economy and our Government. We have never had a real understanding of the economic responsibilities of the President as Chief of the executive branch, and of the Congress of the United States.

The proposed full employment bill supplies us the three elements we have lacked in the past.

First, it establishes a national policy on the maintenance of employment opportunities. Second, it creates a budgetary system to appraise the operations of both the national economy and the Government. Third, it defines the economic responsibilities of the President and the Congress.

These three elements, when added together, provide the opportunity for full and wholehearted cooperation between industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments and the Federal Government—the cooperation which is essential to our hopes and plans for a stronger and better America.

#### THE ORIGINAL BILL

At the time of introduction, this legislation was cosponsored by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and myself. A few months later, the following group of distinguished Senators from the minority party offered certain amendments and joined in the sponsorship of the bill: the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

In the House of Representatives, the bill was sponsored by the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Small Business [Mr. PATMAN], and cosponsored by a group of 115 Members of the House. As in the Senate, a number of the House sponsors were Members of the minority party.

From the day this bill was introduced, it has been bitterly opposed by those extremists who fight every advancement which has been proposed to make our economic system work in the interests and welfare of the whole people. Special lobbyists were rushed to Washington to work against the bill. An organized letter-writing campaign was initiated to misrepresent the bill in the eyes of the

Congress. Scores of pamphlets and brochures denouncing the bill were printed and distributed widely.

Despite this barrage of propaganda and great expenditure of money, the bill evoked enthusiastic and widespread support. Far-sighted businessmen, economists, mayors, governors, religious leaders, farm leaders, representatives of organized labor—all joined in publicly recognizing that the principles of the bill provided an indispensable foundation for an intelligent program to provide employment opportunities for all who are willing and able to work.

The bill was officially endorsed by a large group of American organizations. I offer but a partial list of such organizations, as follows:

The American Federation of Labor; Railroad Labor Executives Association; Congress of Industrial Organizations; United Mine Workers; American Association of Social Workers; American Jewish Congress; Americans United for World Organization; American Veterans Committee; Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees; Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; Business Men of America, Inc.; Central Council of American Rabbis; Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches; Disabled American Veterans; Hosiery Wholesalers National Association; Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions; League of Women Shoppers; Methodist Federation for Social Service; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; National Catholic Welfare Conference; National Conference of Jewish Women; National Consumers League; National Council of Negro Women; National Council of Scientific, Professional, Art, and White Collar Organizations; National Council for the Social Studies; National Education Association of the United States; National Farmers Union; National Grange; National Lawyers' Guild; National Urban League; National Women's Trade Union League of America; Non-Partisan Council of Alpha Kappa Alpha; Southern Conference for Human Welfare; Synagogue Council of America; Union for Democratic Action; United Christian Council for Democracy; United Council of Church Women; United States Conference of Mayors; and the United Steelworkers of America.

I cannot at this time attempt to review the long and detailed history of this legislation as it has progressed through the two Houses of Congress.

Let me merely state that after careful hearings and intensive consideration by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, under the able leadership of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the bill passed the Senate on September 28, 1945, by a vote of 71 to 10.

#### THE SENATE BILL

Let me briefly review the basic provisions of the Senate bill.

The declaration of policy, set forth in section 2, provided the following:

First, the objective of full employment—which was defined in terms of

employment opportunities for all who are able to work and seeking work;

Second, a declaration of the Federal Government's responsibility for assuring full employment;

Third, a declaration that all Americans able to work and seeking work are entitled to an opportunity for employment;

Fourth, a requirement of a consistent and carefully planned economic program;

Fifth, the policy of providing whatever Federal investment and expenditure might be needed, as a last resort, to achieve full employment; and

Sixth, the policy that the full employment program should aim at expanded foreign trade without economic warfare.

In section 3, the Senate bill provided for an annual Presidential message to Congress, to be called the National Production and Employment Budget. This message was to contain the following:

First, economic goals on employment, production, and consumption;

Second, an appraisal of current and foreseeable trends on employment, production, and consumption;

Third, a review of the Government's economic program during the preceding year and of its impact upon economic trends; and

Fourth, a general program for achieving the desired goals.

In section 4, the Senate bill dealt with the preparation of the President's message. This section left the question of administrative machinery entirely to the discretion of the President but merely provided consultation with the heads of departments and agencies. It also provided for mandatory consultation with industry, agriculture, labor, consumers and State and local governments and authorized the creation of whatever advisory committees might be needed for this purpose.

In section 5, the Senate bill set up a joint committee to analyze the President's message. This committee was to be composed of 15 Members from each House, to be selected at the discretion of the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

As compared with the original measure, the Senate bill was in some respects weakened. In other respects it was strengthened. All in all, it was a good measure and a credit to the Senate.

#### THE HOUSE BILL

In the House of Representatives the bill did not fare so well. The House Committee on Executive Expenditures reported out a substitute measure which was totally inadequate.

On the floor of the House there was no record vote through which the Members of the House could express themselves on the merits of the Senate bill, and the proposed substitute was accepted. After this action by the House, President Truman wrote to the chairman of the Senate conferees, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the chairman of the House conferees, Mr. MANASCO, and expressed his preference for the Senate bill. I and the other sponsors of the measure fully agreed with the President's position. In fact, I have always maintained that it would be better to have no legislation whatso-



ever than to have enacted into law this wholly inadequate measure proposed by the House.

The conference committee wisely rejected the House measure and worked out a bill of its own.

#### THE FINAL ACT

Now we have before us the bill as reported by the Senate and House conferees. It is for us to consider whether or not this bill should be accepted and approved.

On the day that the conference bill was made public I expressed my great disappointment that the basic concepts of the bill were not set forth in more clear-cut and vigorous language. However, it seemed to me that the conference measure, as explained by the distinguished leader of the majority in submitting the conference report, contained all the essentials of a full employment program, which, if properly and firmly administered, would constitute a real contribution to the successful operation of our economic system.

First of all, the conference bill declares a full employment policy. The House conferees succeeded in eliminating from the bill the words "full employment" and other forthright language. They did not succeed in eliminating the fundamental concept that the Federal Government has the ultimate responsibility for creating and maintaining conditions of full employment.

Second, the bill provides an employment, production, and consumption budget. The term "national production and employment budget" was eliminated and the term "economic report" used instead. However, the content of the national production and employment budget has not been changed in any material fashion.

Third, the bill accepts the House recommendation that a Council of Economic Advisers be established to help the President discharge his responsibilities under the act. At the same time the House provisions were substantially improved.

Fourth, the bill follows the line of all previous versions and sets up a Joint Committee on the Economic Report. In my opinion, the conference provisions on the joint committee constitute an important improvement over previous versions.

I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate our distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky who served as chairman of the conference committee in the absence of the able Senator from New York (Mr. WAGNER), who has contributed so much to the handling of this bill in the Senate. Despite his other duties as majority leader, as chairman of the Pearl Harbor Investigating Committee, and as ranking member of many other important Senate committees, the Senator from Kentucky accepted the responsibility of serving as chairman of the conference committee and devoted two continuous weeks to detailed and intensive work on the bill that is now before us.

When the conference committee started its sessions, there were many who were firmly convinced that no adequate

bill could be developed which would be acceptable to the House conferees. I, for one, doubted that it could be done. The fact that it has been done is eloquent testimony to the statesmanship, perseverance, and persuasiveness of our majority leader.

I should now like to comment upon the major sections of the conference bill.

#### SECTION 2

The declaration of policy is set forth in section 2. This declaration reads as follows:

The Congress hereby declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

Does this declaration set forth the objective of full employment?

The answer to this question is "Yes," but instead of using the words "full employment," the bill uses the accepted definition of full employment. The specific language used is—

conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work.

This concept embraces the entire labor force. It is the substance of what is meant by the words "full employment."

Does the declaration recognize the Government's basic responsibility for maintaining conditions of full employment?

The answer to this question is also in the affirmative. Section 2 provides that the responsibility of the Federal Government is one of "creating and maintaining" conditions of full employment. Although the term "assure" which appeared in the original bill and the Senate bill is not used, the words "creating and maintaining" are substantially equivalent.

The conference bill also provides that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government "to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power." This is a constructive addition to the original bill. Under this provision, in addition to maintaining employment opportunities, the Government is to promote conditions under which those seeking work are able to take advantage of these opportunities, and we will have maximum employment. The use of the concept "maximum production" emphasizes the fact that our objective is not only full employment but also full production—that is, a constantly rising production of goods and services. The use of the concept "maximum purchasing power" recognizes the fundamental fact that full production depends upon attaining a constantly rising level of consumption.

The Senate bill contained the declaration that—

All Americans able to work and seeking work are entitled to an opportunity for useful, remunerative, regular and full-time employment.

While the precise language of this provision is not contained in the conference bill, nevertheless it is obvious that the right to work is implicit in the language of the conference bill which declares the Government's responsibility to create and maintain employment opportunities "for those able, willing, and seeking to work." Implementation of the right is the important thing. The exact words defining the right are unimportant so long as the intent is there. Here the intent is clear: to create a responsibility on the part of the Government to create and maintain job opportunities for citizens "able, willing, and seeking to work."

The original bill and the Senate bill committed the Federal Government, with certain qualifications, to provide whatever Federal investment and expenditure might be needed, as a last resort, to maintain full employment. But the conference bill does not refer to specific methods of affecting the level of employment. It makes no mention of Federal investment and expenditure, public works, loans, monopoly and competition, taxation or any other specific function of the Federal Government. Instead it calls upon the Federal Government to "coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions and resources" to achieve the desired objective.

This concept of utilizing all the vast resources of the Federal Government for the purpose of maintaining conditions of full employment appeared in none of the previous versions of this measure. It is a constructive and statesmanlike method of defining the Government's obligation to its citizens. I regard it as an improvement in the bill.

The declaration uses the phrase "to use all practicable means." This emphasizes that the Government's responsibility must be discharged effectively.

Like the Senate bill, it uses the phrase "consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy." This provision recognizes that the maintenance of employment opportunities is not the sole objective of Federal policy. There are many other important objectives of national policy—such as the promotion of a higher standard of living, the protection of human rights, the maintenance of friendly economic relations with other nations, sound fiscal policy, national defense and security, and so forth. Obviously, there should be no conflict between our full employment program and measures intended to attain these other objectives of national policy. In fact, by creating and maintaining conditions of full employment and full production we shall be making an indispensable contribution to the attainment of these other important objectives.

The declaration also uses the language "with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments." This provision, which was taken from the Senate bill

recognizes that the Federal Government does not have the sole responsibility with respect to employment. It recognizes that the creation and maintenance of employment opportunities must be a joint undertaking, that in a democracy a government program must reflect the will of all its citizens.

Finally, there is the language "in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare." This concept was contained in all of the previous versions of the bill.

#### SECTION 3

Section 3 of the conference bill contains the full substance of the Senate provisions on the National Production and Employment Budget. According to its provisions, the President shall transmit to the Congress an annual message setting forth:

First, the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power needed to carry out the declaration of policy;

Second, current and foreseeable trends in the level of employment, production, and purchasing power;

Third, a review of the economic effects of the Government's program; and

Fourth, a program for carrying out the policy declared in section 2.

The only substantive change that has been made is that while the Senate bill called for quarterly reports to Congress, the conference bill provides that the President may transmit supplementary reports from time to time. The use of the term "Economic Report," instead of the term "National Production and Employment Budget," is merely a verbal change which has no material effect on the content of the section.

#### SECTION 4

Section 4 of the conference bill sets up a Council of Economic Advisers composed of three persons exceptionally qualified to analyze economic developments. These men are to be paid \$15,000 per year and are to be confirmed by the Senate.

The House version of this section provided that all of the studies, reports, and recommendations of these three advisers to the President be available for use by the joint committee. If this provision had been maintained it would have given the three economic advisers an independent status apart from the Presidency. Conference bill eliminates this provision, thereby emphasizing the fact that their function is to assist the President in discharging his responsibilities under the act.

The Senate bill had contained mandatory provisions on consultation with industry, agriculture, labor, consumers, and State and local governments. To my regret, the consultation provision in the conference bill is permissive instead of mandatory. Moreover, the responsibility for the consultation is to be discharged by the Council of Economic Advisers rather than the President. I assume, however, that a really conscientious Council would lose no time in calling upon industry, agriculture, labor, consumers, and State and local governments to make their most effective contribution

to the development of our full-employment program.

Section 5 establishes a Joint Committee on the Economic Report to analyze the President's report to Congress and to help coordinate the diverse activities of the several committees of Congress.

It follows the Senate version by leaving the appointment of the committee's members entirely to the discretion of the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

It follows the House version by reducing the membership of the joint committee. In fact it goes even further than the House version by limiting the committee to 7 members from each House. This, I think, is an improvement in the bill, for a committee of 14 will be able to act in a more unified and decisive manner than would a committee of larger membership.

Section 6, on interpretations, which appeared in all previous versions, has been eliminated. This is an improvement, because the section was really unnecessary.

#### SUMMARY OF THE ACT

The more I study the bill as reported by the conference committee, the more I am convinced that it can carry out the original intentions of its sponsors. Its declaration of policy is historic in its implications. When the history of this period is written it will record that just as Federal responsibility for relief was accepted during the great depression, Federal responsibility for maintaining conditions of full employment was proclaimed by the Congress following the end of World War II.

The provisions on the economic report should be of incalculable value in giving the entire country an annual appraisal of how our economy is operating.

The provisions for a Council of Economic Advisers should be of great help to the President and the Executive Office in coordinating the vastly expanded operation of the executive branch.

The Joint Committee on the Economic Report should be a tremendous contribution to the improved organization and operation of the Congress.

But the passage of the Employment Act should give no one a sense of false security. Full employment cannot be maintained without hard work and hard thinking on the part of all our people.

Moreover, let us not underestimate the opposition to full employment. We have still in this country those extremists who fight every advancement proposed to make our economic system work in the interest and welfare of the whole people. From the day this legislation was first introduced, it has been misrepresented by its enemies.

Because of this bitter opposition, while the true purpose and intent of the bill is there, it lacks some of the forthright language contained in the original bill. A desperate effort will be made by its enemies to misconstrue and thereby destroy it. This should be a warning to any who might suspect that the road to full employment is short and easy. Many things, of course, remain to be done in order to carry out the policy of the bill.

#### EXECUTIVE ADMINISTRATION OF THE EMPLOYMENT ACT

The first task under the Employment Act of 1946 will be to develop a sound administrative structure in the executive branch.

When new legislation is enacted, it often happens that many months and sometimes many years are spent in the trial-and-error process of developing an administrative organization. This is what occurred with the Smaller War Plants Corporation. It is what happened with the Surplus Property Administration. Other Members of the Senate will name many other examples. It would be a tragic commentary upon the vast efforts that have been expended in obtaining a sound employment act if the passage of this legislation were to be followed by the usual period of groping and fumbling.

During the past year, therefore, I have had an intensive study made of the problems that must be faced in the administration of a full employment program. At this point I should like to set forth the conclusions I have arrived at—in the hope that they will be of value in the months that lie ahead.

First of all, the basic responsibility for developing the employment program within the executive branch is that of the President, not of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Some proposals that have been made for economic planning have aimed at placing the responsibility in the hands of planning boards. The effect of this act, however, is to underscore the responsibility of the President as the elected representative of the entire country, and as head of the executive branch of the Government. The Council set up in this bill is entirely subordinate to the President. It has no independent nor autonomous authority. Its members, like other officials in the Executive Office, can be removed by the President at any time and for any cause.

The purpose of creating a Council of Economic Advisers is merely to provide additional assistance to the President in order to help him in discharging his responsibilities. The successful operation of the Council will depend not only upon the qualifications of the men selected, but also upon their ability to cooperate with the President's other assistants and advisers.

Second. The members of the Council of Economic Advisers must be wholeheartedly devoted to the principles of the bill.

The employment bill as reported by the conference committee provides that the members of the Council of Economic Advisers be exceptionally qualified to "appraise programs and activities of the Government in the light of the policy declared in section 2." This means that they must subscribe without reservation to the policy declared in section 2. It means that they must believe in the objective of full employment, in the basic responsibility of the Federal Government for maintaining conditions of full employment, and in the need for the Government to utilize all its resources



for the purpose of discharging this responsibility.

Third. The facilities of the Bureau of the Budget must be used to the fullest.

In recent years the Bureau of the Budget has demonstrated that it is the major organ in the executive branch capable of coordinating the many and diverse activities of all the agencies and establishments. Every agency must come to this Bureau and justify its requests for appropriations. In so doing it must give a full explanation of its plans and policies. Accordingly, in its efforts to achieve the most efficient use of Federal funds, the Budget Bureau must necessarily perform the function of coordinating, under the direction of the President, the plans and policies of all the various agencies. As President Truman stated in his combined state of the Union and Budget message transmitted on January 21, 1946:

The budgetary program and the general program of the Government are actually inseparable. The budget is the annual work program of the Government.

With the enactment of this legislation, the coordinating function of the Budget Bureau must be developed still further. Unless this is done, the President will be unable to perform the task assigned him by the bill.

Fourth. Program offices should be established in all the various agencies.

The planning function should be decentralized as widely as possible throughout the various agencies, departments, and commissions. In this way, the full employment program can be planned with the full participation of specialized experts in every branch of the Federal Government. This would also contribute to keeping the size of the central staff to a minimum and to carrying out the intent of section 4 (e) (2), which calls for fully utilizing the services of other Government agencies.

Fifth. There should be more effective use of interdepartmental committees to handle problems that cut across agency lines.

Very effective work has been done in recent months through the Interdepartmental Committee on Foreign Economic Relations, which was organized by the State Department. Similar committees might well be established to deal with the complicated interagency problems involved in fiscal policy, monopoly regulation, construction and capital investment, development of underdeveloped areas, public welfare, and similar matters.

Sixth. Funds should be available for research work by State and local planning boards, universities, and similar agencies.

The Federal Government should not try to do all the research. Significant contributions to a full employment policy can be made by planning boards, universities, and research institutions throughout the country. Section 4 (e) (2) of the bill specifically calls for an effort in this direction. This section should be implemented by adequate appropriations.

Seventh. A complete economic statistical program is essential.

It would be a sad mistake to think that the only statistical information needed in the preparation of the economic report is data on employment, production, and purchasing power. Nothing less than a complete program of economic statistics—covering prices, profits, wages, productivity, and so forth—will meet the need. This means central statistical planning, along the lines already established under the Federal Reports Act, to first, fill in the gaps; second, adjust the time lags; third, analyze and interpret the data; fourth, make full use of non-government sources; fifth, establish statistical standards; and sixth, keep reports and questionnaires to a minimum.

Eighth. Special attention should be given to the question of Federal-State-local relationships.

The policies of States and local governments have an important role to play in our full employment program. This matter has been seriously neglected in the past. The successful administration of this act calls for a serious and concerted approach toward coordinating the taxation and expenditure programs of State and local governments, toward eliminating interstate trade barriers and toward developing grass roots planning throughout the country.

Ninth, and last, there must be provision for coordinated administration and continuous check-up on progress.

Legislative and executive policies have repeatedly been frustrated through ineffective administration. In many cases, moreover, the President has no means of knowing in what manner important programs are being carried out. Accordingly, it is essential that major attention be given to obtaining accurate reports of what is really going on throughout the executive establishment, and to achieving the full coordination of executive activities.

#### CONGRESSIONAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE EMPLOYMENT ACT

From the day this legislation was first introduced, the provision for a joint congressional committee to analyze the President's over-all program has been hailed as a distinct contribution to the improvement of congressional operations.

There is general agreement that such a committee could be extremely helpful in coordinating the separate and diverse activities of the many committees in the Senate and the House of Representatives. For example, let me quote from the Senate Banking Committee's minority report on the full employment bill:

We believe there should be such a joint committee studying the effect of proposed legislation on economic stability. We question somewhat whether the standing committees will pay much attention to the report of the joint committee, but it should be helpful by revealing to these committees and the individual Members of the Senate the relationship of this measure to an over-all economic program.

Accordingly, we must take great care to establish this joint committee on sound principles.

First of all, careful consideration should be given to the idea of having the chairmanship and the vice chairman-

ship of the joint committee held by the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House of Representatives.

Let us not forget the fact that this joint committee is to serve as an economic policy committee. Its chairman and vice chairman, therefore, might well be those Members of Congress who are responsible for over-all policy. If any other Members of the Congress were selected as chairman and vice chairman of the joint committee and if they succeeded in discharging their duties successfully, then they might find themselves, in large part, performing certain functions of majority leadership.

For the same reason, the leaders of the minority party in both Houses might well serve as the ranking minority members of the joint committee.

Second, the joint committee should submit regular reports on the progress of the full employment program in Congress.

Both the general public and Members of the Congress themselves need regular information on the status of the various measures that make up the President's full employment program. This information should be provided in a regular report of the joint committee explaining the status of each proposal and indicating what changes, if any, have been made by the various committees and Houses of Congress.

Third, the members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report should limit their activities on other committees.

Effective work by congressional committees becomes impossible when individual Members have too many committee assignments. In view of the importance of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, therefore, the members of the joint committee should limit their activities on other committees. Since committee assignments in the Senate are much heavier than in the House of Representatives, this applies particularly to the Senate.

Fourth, more rapid progress is needed toward the general improvement of congressional organization.

The successful operation of the joint committee would be merely a first step in the improved organization of the Congress. It cannot be regarded as a substitute for more adequate staffing in our legislative committees, for closer cooperation between committees dealing with related topics, for closer relationships between the two Houses, and for the many other fundamental improvements.

I am looking forward with great anticipation to the forthcoming report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, headed by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. It is my earnest hope that this report will be acted upon, not merely filed away for future study. Unless we achieve a comprehensive strengthening of the Congress, I see little hope that the legislative branch of our Government will be able to do its part in maintaining an economy of full production and full employment.

## THE NEED FOR PUBLIC SUPPORT

But even with the most effective planning within the executive branch, even with the most effective operations by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, there is no guaranty that the Congress will make the correct decisions.

The Members of Congress are the representatives of the American people. The wisdom of their decisions, therefore, will depend on how well the American people understand the economic problems facing our country and how effectively they take a position on these matters and present their views to their elected representatives in the Congress. If the American people fail to take a strong position back of this program and demand that this act be effectively enforced, it will become dormant and useless to carry our country through the dangerous days ahead. But if this legislation is given wholehearted support, it will provide a firm foundation upon which we may go forward to a golden age of full employment and prosperity. It will become the framework within which industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government can work together to translate into a living reality our hopes and plans for a stronger and better America.

Mr. President, millions of our citizens have high hopes for the success of this program. The future of our system of free enterprise depends upon its capacity with the cooperation of our Government to build an economy of full production, employment and prosperity for the American people.

I urge that those who in the past have declared that full employment is a policy foreign to our system of Government and cannot be maintained under our system set aside their doubts and join with the sponsors of this legislation in an all-out effort to preserve our country from a major depression 5 or 6 years hence.

Let us provide for all our people the opportunity and security that is their rightful heritage as Americans.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I rise to express the hope and wish that the pending conference report will be agreed to. It represents the beneficial results of much careful study.

A few moments ago the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] stated that in the beginning of the so-called full employment legislation I was one of those who felt that the bill, as originally drafted, should be modified. Such was the case, as I thought that substantial changes should be made in it. I was and am heartily in favor of doing everything which will help to promote employment and production by sound and reasonable methods, but I felt that there was language in the bill which probably would attempt to commit us to a program which we could not succeed in following out in a spirit of wisdom, and that the language in various respects was unfortunately chosen. I suggested various amendments, some of which were adopted in committee and on the floor. The language of one amendment I submitted which was opposed in committee and on the floor of the Senate was to the effect that whatever the Federal Government

did in attempting to promote employment should be consistent with its needs and obligations, and other essential considerations of national policy. In other words, the Government should, in formulating its policies, consider each phase of the problem on its intrinsic merits as of the moment and judge accordingly in a true sense of proportion. The actual language itself is not important, but I am very glad that that is its underlying idea, and in fact my phraseology has been embodied in the conference agreement and is now before us. I think the amendment gives us a much better balanced situation and sets forth a true sense of relative values.

The bill has been studied very carefully throughout its various phases of legislative procedure. An unusual amount of time has been devoted to it. I believe that we have at last evolved a measure which will be satisfactory. It has been accepted unanimously by the conferees of both Houses of Congress, of which I was one, and is now before the Senate for action. I am confident that this measure will in its operation be helpful to labor, to industry, and to the country as a whole. I certainly trust that the conference report will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

## QUOTAS ON BURLEY TOBACCO

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, is the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] in the Chamber? There is a bill on the calendar in which he is interested.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I beg the Senator's pardon. I wanted him to yield to me for a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. ELLENDER. I had agreed to yield to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Alabama wishes to address the Senate. I think I can dispose of this bill in 5 minutes. I wish to go to the Pearl Harbor Committee as soon as possible.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator has taken a great deal of time since he first told me about that committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I will waive my opportunity in favor of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. ELLENDER. If that may be done with the understanding that my rights will not be jeopardized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With the understanding that the Senator from Louisiana does not lose the floor, the Senator from Kentucky may proceed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, House bill 5135, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, was

unanimously reported in the House by the Committee on Agriculture, and passed without objection in the House. Full hearings were held on it before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and it was unanimously reported to the Senate and is now on the calendar. I ask that I may call it up at this time only because of the urgency of it. It is a bill which affects the production of burley tobacco for the crop year of 1946. I may say that two or three weeks ago representatives of all the tobacco organizations from all the tobacco-growing States met in Washington in consultation with the Department of Agriculture, and agreed on this proposed legislation.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Does the Senator mean the producers' organizations?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; the producers' organizations, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Grange, the Department of Agriculture, and all the Members of the House of Representatives representing tobacco-growing States.

The reason for the bill is very simple. During the war there was an increase in consumption of tobacco for cigarette purposes, which resulted in an increase in the price of tobacco. Of course, labor costs also went up.

The total crop of burley tobacco for 1945 amounted to 603,000,000 pounds. The market ordinarily opens the 1st of December, and when it opened last December the average price of burley tobacco in the State of Virginia was \$52 a hundred. In Kentucky it was \$48 or \$50 a hundred but immediately, when it was discovered that there was a surplus as a result of the enormous production of 1945, the price began to slip, until it went from \$48 or \$50 a hundred down to a level between \$25 and \$30.

The only way to remedy that situation for this year's crop is to bring about a reduction in the quotas. Under an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act the burley tobacco growers, the flue-cured-tobacco growers, and others voted for a quota system. It must be submitted to the growers, and they must vote for it by a vote of 75 percent. However, the election will not be held until next November. That would affect the crop of the following year. Nothing but the legislation which this bill proposes can result in a reduction of the quotas on that particular type of tobacco for 1946.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce the quota for burley tobacco by 10 percent for 1946, and also authorize him to increase the penalty for overproduction on the part of any grower. The present law provides a penalty of 10 cents a pound. When tobacco was selling at 20 cents a pound, that represented 50 percent of its value as a penalty against overproduction. With present prices, the quota system which had been voted by the farmers is nullified.

The bill would amend the law so as to provide for a 40-percent penalty, instead



of a penalty of 10 cents a pound. That is satisfactory to the farmers. They have all endorsed it. The reason why it is necessary to act on the matter now is that farmers are now burning their beds to sow the seed for the production of plants which will be replanted in the spring, and they must know in advance what will be done with respect to quotas before they go too far with their crops.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Someone has indicated to me that the bill comes before us with a unanimous report from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Can the Senator confirm that statement?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true. The same situation was true in the House. It was unanimously reported. It passed the House on the 22d of January without opposition. We had a full day's hearing before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in the Senate. The bill was unanimously reported from that committee, and is now on the calendar with the unanimous endorsement of the committees of both Houses. The tobacco-growing organizations are behind it, as are the Farm Bureau Federation and the Department of Agriculture, which participated in writing the bill. All have endorsed it.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Can the Senator tell me the calendar number of the bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is Calendar No. 932. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], who reported the bill, is now present in the Chamber, and I yield to him to make a further explanation of it.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky has stated the facts. The growers of flue-cured tobacco and burley tobacco, as well as the farm organizations, the warehousemen, and everyone connected with the industry, feel that this is a very necessary measure.

The emergency arises from the fact that the time has now arrived to begin planting, and unless this bill is passed so that quotas may be fixed, this year's production will be interfered with. The bill would not change the quotas on flue-cured tobacco, but only on burley tobacco. The reason for that is that there is a foreign market for flue-cured tobacco, whereas the foreign market for burley tobacco has not been developed. Therefore a surplus has accumulated, depressing the price.

I hope the bill may be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5135) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and also the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Perry, one of its clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1152) to effectuate the purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. DIRKSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 380. An act to declare a national policy on employment, production, and purchasing power, and for other purposes; and

S. 1480. An act for the relief of Charles R. Hooper.

#### FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 101) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

Mr. ELLENDER. I now yield to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I wish to submit a few observations on the pending measure, the FEPC bill. I assure the Senate that I shall not detain it very long.

In the first place, I wish to add to the RECORD additional evidence from farm leaders and officers of some of the large agricultural organizations. A few days ago when I addressed the Senate on this subject I placed in the RECORD a letter from the American Farm Bureau Federation, signed by Mr. Edward O'Neal, its president. I now have a letter from Mr. A. S. Goss, Master of the National Grange, one of the oldest farm organizations in the country, if not the oldest. It has a very large and intelligent membership. I send to the desk my letter to Mr. Goss and his reply, and I ask that they be read at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letters will be read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Mr. A. S. Goss,  
Master, the National Grange,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GOSS: I have your letter of January 31, 1946, in response to my inquiry as to how the Grange stands on H. R. 2232. I am glad to have the information contained in your letter, and I thank you for writing me.

Sincerely yours,

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,  
Washington, D. C., January 31, 1946.  
Hon. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, 2d,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You have asked what our stand is upon H. R. 2232, the so-called fair employment practice bill. The National Grange has never passed on this particular measure, but the executive committee has reviewed the measure in the light of our general policies.

We are opposed to the constant tendency of the Government to regulate our daily lives. We do not believe this sort of regimentation is a constructive approach to the race problem. We believe an employer must have the right to employ whomsoever he wishes and we think the best interests of the minority groups are not being served by thus making the problem a political issue.

Yours sincerely,

A. S. GOSS,  
Master, the National Grange.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from the Utah Wool Growers Association, signed by Mr. James A. Hooper, secretary, and Mr. Don Clyde, president. I ask that the telegram be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the telegram will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, February 4, 1946.  
Senator J. H. BANKHEAD,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Honesty and hard work are prerequisites for winning the peace. Idleness and codling are enemies to progress. Labor must prove worthy of its hire. Producers and consumers must receive consideration. Domestic as well as foreign policies must be based "upon justice no less than upon power." Free enterprise and production will receive serious set-back if the FEPC bill should become law. We are opposed to the bill.

UTAH WOOL GROWERS,  
DON CLYDE, President,  
JAMES A. HOOPER, Secretary.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a telegram from the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association, signed by Judge Montague. I ask that it be read into the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

FORT WORTH, TEX., February 6, 1946.  
Hon. JOHN H. BANKHEAD,  
United States Senate:

The membership of Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association is unalterably opposed to the FEPC bill now being discussed by the Senate. The relationship of employer and employee should always be one voluntarily arranged between the parties. Any forced arrangement such as that which would result from the FEPC bill would be slavery in reverse in that the employer would be deprived of freedom. We sincerely commend the fight being made against this bill and hope that it will be defeated.

THE TEXAS AND SOUTHWESTERN  
CATTLE RAISERS ASSOCIATION,  
By JOE G. MONTAGUE, Attorney.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, in the course of this discussion something has been said about the authorship of the pending bill. I think that subject should be clarified insofar as it can be. I am sorry the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is not now in the Chamber. He made a statement about being the author of the bill. I have no purpose to impeach his statement on that subject, and probably he prepared the bill which was offered. But it is important to examine the source of the material from which the bill was prepared.

In the first place, this subject was brought to the attention of the Congress by Executive Order 8802, issued by

President Roosevelt on June 26, 1941. I ask that that Executive order be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks. I do not wish to take the time to read it just now.

There being no objection, the Executive Order (No. 8802) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE ORDER 8802

Whereas it is the policy of the United States to encourage full participation in the national defense program by all citizens of the United States, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, in the firm belief that the democratic way of life within the Nation can be defended successfully only with the help and support of all groups within its borders; and

Whereas there is evidence that available and needed workers have been barred from employment in industries engaged in defense production solely because of considerations of race, creed, color, or national origin, to the detriment of workers' morale and of national unity:

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes, and as a prerequisite to the successful conduct of our national defense production effort, I do hereby reaffirm the policy of the United States that there shall be no discrimination in the employment of workers in defense industries or Government because of race, creed, color, or national origin, and I do hereby declare that it is the duty of employers and of labor organizations, in furtherance of said policy and of this order, to provide for the full and equitable participation of all workers in defense industries, without discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin;

And it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. All departments and agencies of the Government of the United States concerned with vocational and training programs for defense production shall take special measures appropriate to assure that such programs are administered without discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin:

2. All contracting agencies of the Government of the United States shall include in all defense contracts hereafter negotiated by them a provision obligating the contractor not to discriminate against any worker because of race, creed, color, or national origin;

3. There is established in the Office of Production Management a Committee on Fair Employment Practice, which shall consist of a Chairman and four other members to be appointed by the President. The Chairman and members of the Committee shall serve as such without compensation but shall be entitled to actual and necessary transportation, subsistence and other expenses incidental to performance of their duties. The Committee shall receive and investigate complaints of discrimination in violation of the provisions of this order and shall take appropriate steps to redress grievances which it finds to be valid. The Committee shall also recommend to the several departments and agencies of the Government of the United States and to the President all measures which may be deemed by it necessary or proper to effectuate the provisions of this order.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 26, 1941.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, thereafter President Roosevelt issued Executive Order 9346. It was issued on May 27, 1943, and it amended the previous order, No. 8802. I ask unanimous consent that Executive Order 9346 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the Executive Order, No. 9346, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE ORDER 9346

In order to establish a new Committee on Fair Employment Practice, to promote the fullest utilization of all available manpower, and to eliminate discriminatory employment practices, Executive Order No. 8802 of June 25, 1941, as amended by Executive Order No. 8823 of July 18, 1941, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"Whereas the successful prosecution of the war demands the maximum employment of all available workers regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin; and

"Whereas it is the policy of the United States to encourage full participation in the war effort by all persons in the United States regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, in the firm belief that the democratic way of life within the Nation can be defended successfully only with the help and support of all groups within its borders; and

"Whereas there is evidence that available and needed workers have been barred from employment in industries engaged in war production solely by reason of their race, creed, color, or national origin, to the detriment of the prosecution of the war, the workers' morale, and national unity;

"Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes, and as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, I do hereby reaffirm the policy of the United States that there shall be no discrimination in the employment of any person in war industries or in Government by reason of race, creed, color, or national origin, and I do hereby declare that it is the duty of all employers, including the several Federal departments and agencies, and all labor organizations, in furtherance of this policy and of this order, to eliminate discrimination in regard to hire, tenure, terms, or conditions of employment, or union membership because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

"It is hereby ordered, as follows:

"1. All contracting agencies of the Government of the United States shall include in all contracts hereafter negotiated or renegotiated by them a provision obligating the contractor not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin and requiring him to include a similar provision in all subcontracts.

"2. All departments and agencies of the Government of the United States concerned with vocational and training programs for war production shall take all measures appropriate to assure that such programs are administered without discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

"3. There is hereby established in the Office for Emergency Management of the Executive Office of the President a Committee on Fair Employment Practice, hereinafter referred to as the Committee, which shall consist of a chairman and not more than six other members to be appointed by the President. The chairman shall receive such salary as shall be fixed by the President not exceeding \$10,000 per year. The other members of the Committee shall receive necessary traveling expenses and, unless their compensation is otherwise prescribed by the President, a per diem allowance not exceeding \$25 per day and subsistence expenses on such days as they are actually engaged in the performance of duties pursuant to this order.

"4. The Committee shall formulate policies to achieve the purposes of this order and shall make recommendations to the various Federal departments and agencies and to the President which it deems necessary and

proper to make effective the provisions of this order. The Committee shall also recommend to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission appropriate measures for bringing about the full utilization and training of manpower in and for war production without discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

"5. The Committee shall receive and investigate complaints of discrimination forbidden by this order. It may conduct hearings, make findings of fact, and take appropriate steps to obtain elimination of such discrimination.

"6. Upon the appointment of the Committee and the designation of its chairman, the Fair Employment Practice Committee established by Executive Order No. 8802 of June 25, 1941, hereinafter referred to as the old Committee, shall cease to exist. All records and property of the old Committee and such unexpended balances of allocations or other funds available for its use as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine shall be transferred to the Committee. The Committee shall assume jurisdiction over all complaints and matters pending before the old Committee and shall conduct such investigations and hearings as may be necessary in the performance of its duties under this order.

"7. Within the limits of the funds which may be made available for that purpose, the chairman shall appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel and make provision for such supplies, facilities, and services as may be necessary to carry out this order. The Committee may utilize the services and facilities of other Federal departments and agencies and such voluntary and uncompensated services as may from time to time be needed. The Committee may accept the services of State and local authorities and officials and may perform the functions and duties and exercise the powers conferred upon it by this order through such officials and agencies and in such manner as it may determine.

"8. The Committee shall have the power to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be appropriate or necessary to carry out the provisions of this order.

"9. The provisions of any other pertinent Executive order inconsistent with this order are hereby superseded."

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 27, 1943.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the next development was the introduction of a bill in the House of Representatives by Representative MARCANTONIO. I do not intend to make any offensive remark about him. I suppose he is proud of his record. But I am advised that he voted against every appropriation bill to carry on the war until Russia entered the war, and that after that time he voted for all appropriation bills. I do not know whether he believes in a communistic form of government. The Members of the Senate know something about Mr. MARCANTONIO's record. He is not a Democrat; he is not a Republican. I do not know whether he is a Socialist. Of late, since the American Labor Party was organized, he has belonged to it. I do not know what his record was prior to that time. However, he is the author of the first legislative bill which was introduced on this subject in the Congress of the United States. It is surprising to see so many able, strong Members of the Congress, both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, following



the leadership of Mr. MARCANTONIO on this subject.

Now let us consider the record. Mr. MARCANTONIO introduced his bill on July 20, 1942. It is House bill 7412. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 7412) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.—*

#### FINDINGS AND POLICY

SECTION 1. The practice of some employers in denying employment opportunities to and in discriminating in employment against persons because of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, or citizenship is obnoxious to the fundamental democratic principle of equal opportunity for all, denies basic civil rights and liberties to large sections of the population, is destructive of workers' morale, impairs national unity, and wastes essential manpower.

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to repudiate and prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, or citizenship by employers engaged in the manufacture or furnishing of materials, supplies, articles, equipment, or services to or for the use of the United States or any agency or instrumentality thereof.

#### DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. 1. The term "committee" means the Committee on Fair Employment Practice appointed by the President pursuant to Executive Order No. 8802 of June 25, 1941.

2. The term "person" includes one or more individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.

3. The term "employer" includes any person acting on behalf of or in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly.

4. The term "Federal agency" means any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency or instrumentality of the United States, any corporation, all of the stock of which is beneficially owned by the United States, the District of Columbia, or any Territory or possession of the United States.

5. The term "contractor" means any employer who enters into a contract with a Federal agency for the manufacture or furnishing of materials, supplies, articles, equipment, or services.

6. The term "subcontractor" means any employer who enters into a contract with a contractor for the manufacture or furnishing of materials, supplies, articles, equipment or services for use in, or in connection with, or necessary for, the performance by the contractor of its contract with a Federal agency.

7. The term "fair employment practice provisions" means (a) the provisions contained in any contract between a Federal agency and a contractor, or between a contractor and a subcontractor pursuant to the requirements of section 4 of this act, and (b) the provisions contained in any defense contract pursuant to the requirements of paragraph 2 of Executive Order No. 8802 dated June 25, 1941.

#### FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE PROVISIONS

SEC. 3. It shall be an unfair employment practice for any contractor or subcontractor to refuse to hire any person, or in solicitation for hire, hiring, training, tenure, or any other term or condition of employment to discriminate against any person because of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, or citizenship: *Provided*, That it shall not be

an unfair employment practice to deny employment in specified occupations to non-citizens or alien enemies, where such denial of employment is required by the terms of any Executive order issued by the President of the United States.

SEC. 4. Every contract entered into by a Federal agency with a contractor shall include the following fair employment practice provisions:

(a) That the contractor will not, in the performance of such contract or otherwise, engage in any unfair employment practice;

(b) That the contractor shall include in every contract executed by it with a subcontractor, an agreement, for the use and benefit of the United States, that such subcontractor will not engage in any unfair employment practice in the performance of such subcontract or otherwise.

#### ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 5. 1. The committee is empowered and directed, as hereinafter provided, to prevent the violation of and to enforce fair employment practice provisions.

2. Whenever the committee has reason to believe or whenever a charge has been made that any contractor or subcontractor has violated or is violating the fair employment practice provisions of any contract to which it is a party, the committee shall have power to issue and cause to be served upon such contractor or subcontractor a complaint stating the charges in that respect, and containing a notice of hearing before the committee at a place therein fixed to be held not less than 7 days after the serving of said complaint. Any such complaint may be amended by the committee or its agent conducting the hearing at any time prior to the issuance of an order based thereon. The person so complained of shall have the right to file an answer to the original or amended complaint not less than 5 days after the service of such original or amended complaint and to appear in person or otherwise to give testimony at the place and time set in the complaint. In the discretion of a member or agent conducting the hearing, or of the committee, any other person may be allowed to intervene in the proceeding and to present testimony. In any such proceeding the rules of evidence prevailing in the courts of law or equity shall not be controlling.

SEC. 6. The testimony taken at the hearing shall be reduced to writing and filed with the committee. Thereafter, in its discretion, the committee, upon notice, may take further testimony or hear argument. If upon all the testimony taken the committee shall determine that the respondent has violated or is violating any fair employment practice provision, the committee shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such respondent an order requiring such respondent to cease and desist from such violations and from any and all other violations of such fair employment practice provisions and to take such of the following further action as the committee may direct:

(a) Payment into the Treasury of the United States, as liquidated damages for such violation, the sum of \$500 per day for each day of the continuance of such violation.

(b) The hiring of any person refused employment or the reinstatement of any person discharged or laid off in violation of such fair employment practice provisions.

(c) The transfer of any person from an occupation in which he is employed to an occupation in which he was denied employment or from which he was transferred in violation of such fair employment practice provisions.

(d) The award of back pay from the date of any refusal to hire, lay off, discharge, or other discrimination in hiring, tenure, or

other term or condition of employment in violation of such fair employment practice provisions.

(e) Such other affirmative action as will effectuate the policy of this act.

(f) The making of reports to the committee from time to time showing the extent to which the order has been complied with.

If upon all the testimony the committee shall be of the opinion that the person or persons named in the complaint have not violated and are not violating such fair employment practice provisions, then the committee shall make its findings of fact and shall issue an order dismissing the complaint.

Until a transcript of the record in a case shall have been filed in a court, the committee may at any time, upon reasonable notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify or set aside, in whole or in part, any finding or order made or issued by it.

SEC. 7. Unless the committee shall otherwise determine and state in its order, no contractor or subcontractor against whom the committee has entered an order pursuant to section 6, and no person exercising a controlling interest in such contractor or subcontractor shall be awarded a contract as a contractor or subcontractor until 3 years have elapsed from the date of such order of the committee. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to distribute a list to all Federal agencies, and such Federal agencies are authorized and directed to distribute a list to all contractors containing the names of persons who have been barred from becoming contractors or subcontractors pursuant to the provisions of this section.

#### ENFORCEMENT AND REVIEW

SEC. 8. Proceedings for the enforcement of any order of the committee may be taken and prosecuted by the committee and proceedings for the review of any final order of the committee may be taken and prosecuted by any person aggrieved thereby in the same manner and form and with the same effect as is provided by subdivisions (e) to (i), inclusive, of section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act with reference to proceedings for the enforcement or review of orders of the National Labor Relations Board: *Provided*, That the court in which a petition for enforcement or review shall be filed and which shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding shall be any circuit court of appeals of the United States (including the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia) within any circuit wherein the violation in question of the fair employment practice provisions occurred or wherein the respondent named in the order of the committee resides or transacts business, or (in the case of a petition to review an order of the committee) in the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia.

#### INVESTIGATORY POWERS

SEC. 9. For the purpose of all hearings and investigations which, in the opinion of the committee, are necessary or proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by this Act, the committee, its members, and its duly authorized agents or agencies shall have and may exercise all of the powers vested in the National Labor Relations Board by subdivisions (1) to (6), inclusive, of section 11 of the National Labor Relations Act, and all of the provisions of said subdivisions shall be applicable to hearings and investigations conducted by the committee under this act.

SEC. 10. Any person who shall willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere with any member of the committee or any of its agents or agencies in the performance of duties pursuant to this act shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

#### MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 11. The committee may, by one or more of its members or by such agents or

agencies as it may designate, prosecute any inquiry necessary to its functions in any part of the United States. The committee may establish or utilize such regional, local, or other agencies and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as may from time to time be needed. Attorneys appointed by the committee may appear for and represent the committee in any court proceeding.

SEC. 12. The committee shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. Such rules and regulations shall be effective upon publication in the manner prescribed by the committee.

SEC. 13. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the "Fair Employment Practice Act."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, who introduced the next bill on the subject? It was introduced by Mr. Scanlon, a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Pennsylvania, and a Democrat. He introduced House bill 3986. It is strange to find that the bill pending before us, Senate bill 101, is stated in language almost exactly the same as that used in the Scanlon bill, which was introduced several months before Senate bill 101 was introduced. I send to the desk a copy of the Scanlon bill, House bill 3986, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3986) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,—*

#### FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the practice of denying employment opportunities to, and discriminating in employment against, properly qualified persons by reason of their race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, foments domestic strife and unrest, deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production and defense, and burdens, hinders, and obstructs commerce.

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate such discrimination in all employment relations which fall within the jurisdiction or control of the Federal Government as hereinafter set forth.

#### RIGHT TO FREEDOM FROM DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

SEC. 2. The right to work and to seek work without discrimination because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry is declared to be an immunity of all citizens of the United States, which shall not be abridged by any State or by an instrumentality or creature of any State.

#### UNFAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES DEFINED

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be an unfair employment practice for any employer within the scope of this act—

(1) to refuse to hire any person because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

(2) to discharge any person from employment because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

(3) to discriminate against any person in compensation or in other terms or conditions of employment because of such per-

son's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

(b) It shall be an unfair employment practice for any labor union within the scope of this act—

(1) to refuse membership to any person because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

(2) to expel from membership any person because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; or

(3) to discriminate against any member, employer, or employee because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

(c) It shall be an unfair employment practice for any employer or labor union within the scope of this act to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person because he has opposed any practices forbidden by this act or because he has filed a charge, testified, or assisted in any proceeding under this act.

#### SCOPE OF ACT

SEC. 4. (a) This act shall apply to any employer having in his employ more than five persons, who is (1) engaged in interstate or foreign commerce; (2) under contract with the United States or any agency thereof; or (3) performing work, under subcontract or otherwise, called for by a contract to which the United States or any agency thereof is a party.

(b) This act shall apply to any labor union which has five or more members in the employ of one or more employers covered by the preceding paragraph.

(c) This act shall apply to the employment practices in the United States and of every Territory, insular possession, agency, or instrumentality thereof, except that paragraphs (3) and (f) of section 10, providing for petitions for enforcement and review, shall not apply in any case in which an order has been issued against any department or independent agency of the United States; but in any such case the Fair Employment Practice Commission established by section 5 of this act may petition the Attorney General of the United States for the enforcement of such order, and it shall thereupon be the duty of the Attorney General to take such measures as may secure obedience to any such order. Every official who wilfully violates any such order shall be summarily discharged from the Government employ.

#### FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. For the purpose of securing enforcement of the foregoing rights and preventing unfair employment practices on the part of employers and labor unions, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Fair Employment Practice Commission, which shall consist of a chairman and six additional members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall serve for a term of 7 years except that the terms of the members originally appointed shall expire serially at intervals of 1 year. Any member of the commission may be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause. Four members of the Commission shall at all times constitute a quorum.

#### REPORTS

SEC. 6. The Commission shall at the close of each fiscal year make a report in writing to the Congress and to the President concerning the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the Commission, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed, and shall make such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable.

#### SALARIES

SEC. 7. Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary of \$10,000 a year, shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

#### TERMINATION OF COMMITTEE ON FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE

SEC. 8. Upon the appointment of the members of the Commission, the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, established by Executive Order No. 9346 of May 27, 1943, shall cease to exist. All employees of the said Committee shall be transferred to and become employees of the Commission. All records, papers, and property of the Committee shall pass into the possession of the Commission, and all unexpended funds and appropriations for the use and maintenance of the Committee shall be available to the Commission.

#### LOCATION OF OFFICES

SEC. 9. The Commission shall hold its sessions in the District of Columbia and at such other places as it may designate. The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such referees, agents, or agencies as it may designate, prosecute any inquiry or conduct any hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States or any Territory or insular possession thereof.

#### PROHIBITION OF UNFAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

SEC. 10. (a) The Commission is empowered as herein provided to prohibit any person from engaging in any unfair employment practices within the scope of this act.

(b) Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in any such unfair employment practice, the Commission, or any referee, agent, or agency designated by the Commission for such purposes, shall have power to issue and cause to be served upon such person a complaint stating the charges in that respect and containing a notice of hearing before the Commission or a member thereof, or before a designated referee, agent, or agency at a place therein fixed not less than 10 days after the serving of said complaint.

(c) The person so complained of shall have the right to file an answer to such complaint and to appear in person or otherwise, with or without counsel, and give testimony at the place and time fixed in the complaint.

(d) If upon all the testimony taken the Commission shall be of the opinion that any person named in the complaint has engaged in any such unfair employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person an order requiring such person to cease and desist from such unfair employment practice and to take such affirmative action, including hiring or reinstatement of employees with or without back pay, as will effectuate the policies of this act. If, upon all the testimony taken, the Commission shall be of the opinion that no person named in the complaint has engaged in any such unfair employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue an order dismissing the said complaint.

(e) The Commission shall have power to petition any circuit court of appeals of the United States (including the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia) or, if all the circuit courts of appeals to which application might be made are in vacation, any district court of the United States, within any circuit or district, respectively, wherein the unfair employment practice in question occurred, or wherein such person resides or transacts business, for the enforcement of such order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall certify and file in the court to which petition is made a transcript of the entire record in



the proceeding, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings and the order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court to which petition is made shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the procedures established by law governing petitions for enforcement of the orders of the National Labor Relations Board.

(f) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Commission granting or denying in whole or in part the relief sought may obtain a review of such order in any circuit court of appeals of the United States (including the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia) within any circuit wherein the unfair employment practice in question was alleged to have occurred or wherein such person resides or transacts business by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside. Upon such filing, the reviewing court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the procedures established by law governing petitions for review of the orders of the National Labor Relations Board.

#### INVESTIGATORY POWERS

SEC. 11. (a) For the purpose of all hearings and investigations which in the opinion of the Commission are necessary and proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by this act, the Commission, or its duly authorized agents or agencies, shall at all reasonable times have access to, for the purpose of examination, and the right to copy any evidence of any person being investigated or proceeded against that relates to any matter under investigation or in question. Any member of the Commission shall have power to issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to any matter under investigation or in question, before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency conducting the hearing or investigation. Any member of the Commission, or any agent or agency designated by the Commission for such purposes, may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

(b) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to any person, any district court of the United States or the United States courts of any Territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation or in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof.

(c) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to the subpoena of the Commission, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such indi-

vidual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

#### RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 12. The Commission shall have authority from time to time to make, amend, and rescind such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. Such regulations shall be effective 60 days after transmission to the Congress unless the Congress has in the interim amended or nullified such regulations by appropriate legislation or has adjourned within 10 days after the submission of such regulations. Such regulations shall set forth the procedure for service and amendment of complaints, for intervention in proceedings before the Commission, for rules of evidence to be applied by the Commission, for the taking of testimony and its reduction to writing, for the modification of the findings or orders prior to the filing of records in court, for the service and return of process and fees of witnesses, and with respect to the seal of the Commission, which shall be judicially noticed, the payment of expenses of members and employees of the Commission, the qualification and disqualification of members and employees and any other matters appropriate in the execution of the provisions of this act.

#### GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

SEC. 13. (a) All contracting agencies of the Government of the United States shall include in all contracts hereafter negotiated or renegotiated by them a provision obligating the contractor not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, and requiring him to include a similar provision in all subcontracts.

(b) Unless the Commission shall otherwise determine and state in its order, no contract shall be awarded by the United States or any agency thereof to any person found by the Commission to have violated any of the provisions of this act or to any firm, corporation, partnership, or association in which such person has a controlling interest, until 3 years have elapsed from the date when the Commission determines such violation to have occurred. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to distribute a list to all agencies of the United States containing the names of such persons.

#### OFFENSES AND PENALTIES

SEC. 14. Any person who shall willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere with any member of the Commission or any of its referees, agents, or agencies, in the performance of duties pursuant to this act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

#### SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 15. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of such act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

#### DEFINITIONS

SEC. 16. (1) The term "person" includes one or more individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.

(2) The term "employer" includes any person acting in the interest of any employer, directly or indirectly.

(3) The term "labor union" includes any organization in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning the terms or conditions of employment.

(4) Unless otherwise specified, the term "Commission" means the Fair Employment

Practice Commission created by section 5 of this act.

(5) The term "Committee" means the Committee on Fair Employment Practice established by Executive Order No. 9346 of May 27, 1943.

(6) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State or other Territory or between any foreign country and any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory, or between points in the same State but through any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign country.

SEC. 17. This act may be cited as the "Fair Employment Practices Act."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, for the benefit of students who hereafter may study the proceedings taken in connection with pending legislation, I ask unanimous consent to have Senate bill 101 printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 101) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.—*

#### FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the practice of denying employment opportunities to, and discriminating in employment against, properly qualified persons by reason of their race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry foment domestic strife and unrest, deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production, endangers the national security and the general welfare, and adversely affects commerce.

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to eliminate such discrimination in all employment relations which fall within the jurisdiction or control of the Federal Government as hereinafter set forth.

#### RIGHT TO FREEDOM FROM DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

SEC. 2. The right to work and to seek work without discrimination because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry is declared to be an immunity of all citizens of the United States, which shall not be abridged by any State or by an instrumentality or creature of the United States or of any State.

#### UNFAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES DEFINED

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be an unfair employment practice for any employer within the scope of this act—

(1) to refuse to hire any person because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

(2) to discharge any person from employment because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

(3) to discriminate against any person in compensation or in other terms or conditions of employment because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; and

(4) to confine or limit recruitment or hiring of persons for employment to any employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor union or organization, or any other source that discriminates against persons because of their race, color, creed, national origin or ancestry.

(b) It shall be an unfair employment practice for any labor union within the scope of this act—

(1) to deny full membership rights and privileges to any person because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry;

(2) to expel from membership any person because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; or

(3) to discriminate against any member, employer, or employee because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

(c) It shall be an unfair employment practice for any employer or labor union within the scope of this act to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person because he has opposed any practices forbidden by this act or because he has filed a charge, testified, or assisted in any proceeding under this act.

#### SCOPE OF ACT

SEC. 4. (a) This act shall apply to any employer having in his employ six or more persons, who is (1) engaged in interstate or foreign commerce or in operations affecting such commerce; (2) under contract with the United States or any agency thereof or performing work, under subcontract or otherwise, called for by a contract to which the United States or any agency thereof is a party, awarded, negotiated, or renegotiated as hereinafter provided in section 13 of this act.

(b) This act shall apply to any labor union which has six or more members who are engaged in interstate or foreign commerce or operations affecting such commerce or employed by the United States or any Territory, insular possession, or instrumentality thereof.

(c) This act shall apply to the employment practices of the United States and of every Territory, insular possession, agency, or instrumentality thereof, except that paragraphs (e) and (f) of section 10, providing for petitions for enforcement and review, shall not apply in any case in which an order has been issued against any department or independent agency of the United States; but in any such case the Fair Employment Practice Commission established by section 5 of this act may petition the President for the enforcement of any such lawful order, and it shall thereupon be the duty of the President to take such measures as may secure obedience to any such order. Every officer, agent, or employee who willfully violates any such order shall be summarily discharged from the Government employ.

#### FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. For the purpose of securing enforcement of the foregoing rights and preventing unfair employment practices on the part of employers and labor unions, there is hereby established a Commission to be known as the Fair Employment Practice Commission, which shall consist of a Chairman and four additional members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall serve for a term of 5 years, except that the terms of the members originally appointed shall expire serially at intervals of 1 year. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for not other cause. Three members of the Commission shall at all times constitute a quorum.

#### REPORTS

SEC. 6. The Commission shall at the close of each fiscal year make a report in writing to the Congress and to the President concerning the cases it has heard, the decisions it has rendered, the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the Commission, and an account of all moneys it has disbursed, and shall make such further reports on the cause of, and means of alleviating discrimination, and such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable.

#### SALARIES

SEC. 7. Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary of \$10,000 a year, shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall not

engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

#### TERMINATION OF COMMITTEE ON FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE

SEC. 8. Upon the appointment of the members of the Commission, the Committee on Fair Employment Practice, established by Executive Order No. 9346 of May 7, 1943, shall cease to exist. All employees of the said Committee shall be transferred to and become employees of the Commission. All records, papers, and property of the Committee shall pass into the possession of the Commission, and all unexpended funds and appropriations for the use and maintenance of the Committee shall be available to the Commission.

#### LOCATION OF OFFICES

SEC. 9. The Commission shall hold its sessions in the District of Columbia and at such other places as it may designate. The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such referees, agents, or agencies as it may designate, prosecute any inquiry or conduct any hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States or any Territory or insular possession thereof.

#### PROHIBITION OF UNFAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

SEC. 10. (a) The Commission is empowered as herein provided to prohibit any person from engaging in any unfair employment practices within the scope of this act.

(b) Whenever it is alleged that any person has engaged in any such unfair employment practice, the Commission, or any referee, agent, or agency designated by the Commission for such purposes, shall have power to issue and cause to be served upon such person a complaint stating the charges in that respect and containing a notice of hearing before the Commission or a member thereof, or before a designated referee, agent, or agency at a place therein fixed not less than 10 days after the serving of said complaint.

(c) The person so complained of shall have the right to file an answer to such complaint and to appear in person or otherwise, with or without counsel, and give testimony at the place and time fixed in the complaint.

(d) If upon the record, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that any person named in the complaint has engaged in any such unfair employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person an order requiring such person to cease and desist from such unfair employment practice and to take such affirmative action, including reinstatement or hiring of employees with or without back pay, as will effectuate the policies of this act. If upon the record, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that no person named in the complaint has engaged in any such unfair employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue an order dismissing the said complaint.

(e) The Commission shall have power to petition any circuit court of appeals of the United States (including the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia) or, if all the circuit courts of appeals to which application might be made are in vacation, any district court of the United States, within any circuit or district, respectively, wherein the unfair employment practice in question occurred, or wherein such person resides or transacts business, for the enforcement of such order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall certify and file in the court to which petition is made a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the finding, and the order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court to which petition is made shall conduct further proceedings in conform-

ity with the procedures and limitations established by law governing petitions for enforcement of the orders of the National Labor Relations Board.

(f) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Commission granting or denying in whole or in part the relief sought may obtain a review of such order in any circuit court of appeals of the United States (including the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia) within any circuit wherein the unfair employment practice in question was alleged to have occurred or wherein such person resides or transacts business by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside. Upon such filing, the reviewing court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the procedures and limitations established by law governing petitions for review of the orders of the National Labor Relations Board.

#### INVESTIGATORY POWERS

SEC. 11. (a) For the purpose of all hearings and investigations which in the opinion of the Commission are necessary and proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by this act the Commission, or its duly authorized agents or agencies, shall at all reasonable times have access to, for the purpose of examination, and the right to copy any evidence of any person being investigated or proceeded against that relates to any matter under investigation or in question. Any member of the Commission shall have power to issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to any matter under investigation or in question, before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency conducting the hearing or investigation. Any member of the Commission, or any agent or agency designated by the Commission for such purposes, may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

(b) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to any person, any district court of the United States or the United States courts of any Territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation or in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof.

(c) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to the subpoena of the Commission, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

#### RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 12. The Commission shall have authority from time to time to make, amend,



and rescind such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. Such regulations shall be effective 60 days after transmission to the Congress unless the Congress has in the interim amended or nullified such regulations by appropriate legislation or has adjourned within 30 days after the submission of such regulations. Such regulations shall include the procedure for service and amendment of complaints, for intervention in proceedings before the Commission, for the taking of testimony and its reduction to writing, for the modification of the findings or orders prior to the filing of records in court, for the service and return of process and fees of witnesses, and with respect to the seal of the Commission, which shall be judicially noticed, the payment of expenses of members and employees of the Commission, the qualification and disqualification of members and employees, and any other matters appropriate in the execution of the provisions of this act.

#### GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Sec. 13. (a) All contracting agencies of the Government of the United States shall include in all contracts hereafter awarded, negotiated, or renegotiated by them, except such classes of contracts as may be exempted from the scope of this provision by regulation adopted pursuant to section 12 of this act, a provision obligating the contractor not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, and requiring him to include a similar provision in all subcontracts.

(b) No contract shall be awarded or executed by the United States or any agency thereof to any person found by the Commission to have violated any of the provisions of this act or to any firm, corporation, partnership, or association in which such person has a controlling interest, for a period to be fixed by the Commission not to exceed 3 years from the date when the Commission determines such violation to have occurred. The Commission may by subsequent order, for good cause shown, reduce any period so fixed. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to distribute a list to all agencies of the United States containing the names of such persons.

#### WILLFUL INTERFERENCE WITH COMMISSION AGENTS

Sec. 14. Any person who shall willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere with any member of the Commission or any of its referees, agents, or agencies, in the performance of duties pursuant to this act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

#### SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

Sec. 15. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of such act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

#### DEFINITIONS

Sec. 16. (1) The term "person" includes one or more individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.

(2) The term "employer" includes any person acting in the interest of any employer, directly or indirectly, and includes the United States and every Territory, insular possession, and agency or instrumentality thereof.

(3) The term "labor union" includes any organization in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning the terms or conditions of employment.

(4) Unless otherwise specified, the term "Commission" means the Fair Employment

Practice Commission created by section 5 of this act.

(5) The term "Committee" means the Committee on Fair Employment Practice established by Executive Order No. 9346 of May 27, 1943.

(6) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State or other Territory or between any foreign country and any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory, or between points in the same State but through any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign country.

(7) The term "affecting commerce" means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce, or having led or tending to lead to a labor dispute burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

Sec. 17. This act may be cited as the "Fair Employment Practice Act."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the similarity between Senate bill 101 and the Marcantonio bill. I ask students of the subject to compare section 1 of the Marcantonio bill with the corresponding section of the pending bill. I ask them to compare section 3 of the pending bill, Senate bill 101, which defines unfair employment practices with section 3 of the Marcantonio bill. I ask them to compare section 10 of the pending bill with section 5 of the Marcantonio bill. I ask them to make a comparison of subsection (e) of section 10 of the pending bill, Senate bill 101, with section 8 of the Marcantonio bill. I ask them to make a comparison of subsection (f) of section 10 of the pending bill, Senate bill 101, with section 8 of the Marcantonio bill. I ask students of the subject to compare section 12 of the pending bill with section 12 of the Marcantonio bill. I ask them to make a comparison of section 13 of the pending bill with section 5 of the Marcantonio bill. I ask them to make a comparison of section 15 of the pending bill with section 13 of the Marcantonio bill. I ask them to make a comparison of section 16 of the pending bill with sections 2 and 3 of the Marcantonio bill.

Mr. President, much has been said about the politics involved in this bill. The subject has been raised on several occasions during the course of this debate. I have endeavored to appraise as best I could the attitude of both parties, from a political standpoint, on this measure. Of course, as we recall, this subject was originally presented to us by President Roosevelt, by means of his Executive orders; but those Executive orders, as will be found by reading them, are exceedingly mild and without force or compulsion such as that provided for in these bills. Still, those Executive orders came from the Democratic Party.

Then, following the introduction of Mr. MARCANTONIO'S bill, Mr. Scanlon introduced his bill. It is exactly like the one we are now considering, Senate bill 101. Mr. Scanlon was a Democrat.

Then along came Mr. DAWSON. On the day after Mr. Scanlon introduced his bill, Mr. Dawson introduced exactly the same bill. He is a Democrat from Illinois.

Then came Mr. LAFOLLETTE. On the same day he introduced House bill 4005. He is a Member of the House of Representatives, and is a Republican from the State of Indiana. The bill he introduced follows the real pattern or fashion set in the Marcantonio bill.

Then came the first Chavez bill, on June 23, 1944. It is to be noted that all the other bills were introduced in January, nearly 5 months before the Chavez bill—as we shall call it here—the bill now under consideration—was introduced. That bill was the one which was introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and other Senators, the same authors as those of the pending bill, except that I believe the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has been recorded as an author of the pending bill and not of the other bill. I refer to Senate bill 2048, which was introduced on June 24, 1944, a bill which was word for word, "t" for "t," and "i" for "i" the same as the bills which were introduced by Representatives Scanlon, Dawson, and LaFollette. Later, on January 6, 1945, the pending bill was introduced. The authors of that bill are the same as those of the bill which was introduced June 24, 1944.

On January 3, 1945, Representative NORTON introduced House bill 523.

On January 4, 1945, Representative BALDWIN of New York introduced House bill 679.

On January 6, 1945, the pending bill was introduced.

On January 11, 1945, Representative HOOK, a Democrat, from Michigan, introduced a similar bill.

On January 17, 1945, Representative DIRKSEN of Illinois introduced a bill which I have not compared with the pending bill.

On January 24, 1945, Representative POWELL introduced House bill 1743. He is a Democrat and a Negro. He may be proud of that fact, and I do not criticize him for it.

On January 25, 1945, Representative BENDER of Ohio, a Republican, introduced the same bill as the one which is now before us.

On January 29, 1945, Representative DOUGLAS of California introduced House bill 1806.

On January 29, the same day, Representative CLASON of Massachusetts, a Republican, introduced a similar bill.

On January 31 Representative DOYLE, a Democrat from California, introduced substantially the same bill.

On the same date, January 31, Representative HOFFMAN, a Republican from Michigan, introduced the same kind of a bill.

On February 4, 1946, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] introduced a bill, but it was not patterned after the others, and that may be said to his credit. I am glad to say it, because he is opposed to the pending bill, although he is in favor of cloture. I have been advised that he was opposed to the bill being reported by the committee.

Mr. President, the authors of those bills comprise about six Republicans and about six Democrats. It looks as though there were a scramble of Representatives

to secure a good position on this subject. The number of Republicans and the number of Democrats in this respect are about equal.

I do not believe that politically there is any advantage to be gained by either party in this situation. I do not believe that either party will get out of this matter any particular credit, because north of the Mason and Dixon's line we find in the main Democrats and Republicans, all of whom want to make a record, especially in the States in which there is a substantial number of Negro votes.

What is the next step by which we can determine whether one party has an advantage over the other, or can appeal to the colored vote through the type of work which is being done in connection with the fostering of the pending bill? I do not know the price which they are willing to pay for serving their country, but I know that so far as many of the States of this country are concerned, they are doing a disservice.

Mr. President, we find that a cloture petition has been brought into the picture. What has happened with respect to it? We find on the petition the names of 48 signers. How do they stand politically? Twenty-four Democrats and 24 Republicans signed the petition. The filing of the petition was delayed for almost a week. I do not know whether it was done by shuffling around to see whether the Democrats could obtain one or more additional signers, or whether the Republicans could obtain one or more additional signers, and thereby have a majority. I do not make such a charge, but I know that before the petition was filed some of us were advised that neither party had obtained any additional signers to the petition. But the whole thing looks like a horse race without our leader taking the position of the leading jockey. That is the position which we now occupy. It is a horse race between the two parties, with the contestants running neck and neck until they go under the wire.

Mr. President, it is very regrettable that political issues of the character which have been raised here are being pressed at this time upon the Congress of the United States. In the South very few complaints have been made by the Committee on Fair Employment Practice. Yet, various newspapers have carried articles, and commentators have talked from time to time about the southern filibuster, as though we southern Senators were the cause of the entire situation.

In the first place, I wish to say—and I think every Senator on this floor will agree with me—that the debate which has taken place in connection with the pending bill has been one in which information, logic, and arguments on economics, on the Constitution, and on many legal phases of this bill have been brought forward. The time has not been consumed in reading from newspapers, books, and roll calls which took up much of the time of previous filibusters. Still, there are those who talk about these southern filibusters. We have discussed the proposal. We have pointed out the viciousness of this bill and its unconstitutionality of it until there are not many

Members of the Senate who, in my judgment, would be willing to vote for the bill in its present form. At any rate, we believe that we have rendered a splendid service to the people of the United States. I shall not go into the merits of the matter at this late hour. I want the RECORD to show, however, that there has been no filibuster upon this measure, although I am not ashamed of filibustering if the very foundations of my section are threatened, whether the threats be of an economic, social, or other character. When proposed legislation is brought before the Senate which appears to be directed at any section of this country, be it the West, East, North, or South, I will join any group of Senators in filibustering it to death. I have no apologies to make in that regard. But, I repeat, Mr. President, there has been no filibustering in the Senate in connection with the pending bill, and all the statements made to the contrary in the newspapers from day to day, are incorrect. Statements have been made that the southern filibusters are still filibustering the bill, and those statements are made for the purpose of striking at the South.

Mr. President, I have before me a table listing the complaints which were filed with the Committee on Fair Employment Practice during the period from August 1, 1943, to January 1, 1946, including complaints made in Southern States during the same period. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total number of cases docketed by States  
Aug. 1, 1943, to Jan. 1, 1946

|                           |       |
|---------------------------|-------|
| Connecticut.....          | 63    |
| Massachusetts.....        | 130   |
| New Hampshire.....        | 1     |
| Maine.....                | 1     |
| Rhode Island.....         | 3     |
| Vermont.....              | 0     |
| New York.....             | 1,313 |
| New Jersey.....           | 253   |
| Delaware.....             | 9     |
| Pennsylvania.....         | 852   |
| Maryland.....             | 144   |
| District of Columbia..... | 280   |
| Virginia.....             | 119   |
| West Virginia.....        | 20    |
| North Carolina.....       | 44    |
| Ohio.....                 | 502   |
| Michigan.....             | 708   |
| Kentucky.....             | 43    |
| Illinois.....             | 703   |
| Indiana.....              | 162   |
| Wisconsin.....            | 26    |
| Alabama.....              | 116   |
| Georgia.....              | 222   |
| Tennessee.....            | 138   |
| Mississippi.....          | 14    |
| South Carolina.....       | 35    |
| Florida.....              | 113   |
| North Dakota.....         | 0     |
| South Dakota.....         | 1     |
| Nebraska.....             | 29    |
| Iowa.....                 | 26    |
| Minnesota.....            | 16    |
| Missouri.....             | 534   |
| Kansas.....               | 78    |
| Oklahoma.....             | 24    |
| Arkansas.....             | 24    |
| Texas.....                | 437   |
| Louisiana.....            | 146   |
| New Mexico.....           | 39    |
| Utah.....                 | 9     |

|                 |       |
|-----------------|-------|
| Idaho.....      | 0     |
| Colorado.....   | 34    |
| Wyoming.....    | 10    |
| Montana.....    | 12    |
| California..... | 1,080 |
| Washington..... | 97    |
| Oregon.....     | 33    |
| Arizona.....    | 77    |
| Nevada.....     | 30    |
| Total.....      | 8,750 |

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, as shown by the table, 8,750 complaints were filed with the Committee on Fair Employment Practice during the period from August 1, 1943, to January 1, 1946. Of those complaints only 1,450 were filed in the 12 Southern States. That constitutes 16 percent of the total number of complaints filed before the Commission charging unfair employment practices.

In the Southern State 26 percent of the total population of this country resides, and out of that whole 26 percent of the population only 16 percent of the complaints have been made about unfair trade practices and discriminations against the Negro.

I do not want to take further time. I know the Senate is anxious to proceed to other matters. I wish to put into the RECORD at this point, however, a list of the Southern States showing the number of complaints filed in each Southern State, constituting 16 percent of the complaints, and the population of the same States, showing that it is 26.4 percent of the total population of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total FEPC cases in United States..... 8,750  
FEPC cases in Southern States..... 1,451

Southern FEPC cases are 16.6 percent of total cases.

| Cases               |     |
|---------------------|-----|
| Virginia.....       | 119 |
| North Carolina..... | 44  |
| South Carolina..... | 35  |
| Kentucky.....       | 43  |
| Alabama.....        | 116 |
| Georgia.....        | 222 |
| Tennessee.....      | 138 |
| Mississippi.....    | 14  |
| Florida.....        | 113 |
| Arkansas.....       | 24  |
| Texas.....          | 437 |
| Louisiana.....      | 146 |

Total..... 1,451

Total population of United States..... 131,669,275

Population of Southern States..... 34,676,653

Population of Southern States is 26.3 percent of total population.

| Population          |            |
|---------------------|------------|
| Southern States:    |            |
| Virginia.....       | 2,677,773  |
| North Carolina..... | 3,571,623  |
| South Carolina..... | 1,899,804  |
| Georgia.....        | 3,123,723  |
| Florida.....        | 1,897,414  |
| Kentucky.....       | 2,845,627  |
| Tennessee.....      | 2,915,841  |
| Alabama.....        | 2,832,961  |
| Mississippi.....    | 2,183,796  |
| Arkansas.....       | 1,949,387  |
| Louisiana.....      | 2,363,880  |
| Texas.....          | 6,414,824  |
| Total.....          | 34,676,653 |

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to express the hope



that such a legislative proposal as the one before us will not be brought here again at an early date. I am sure the Senate has been convinced that the South is doing its full part by the Negro, that it is spending of the taxes collected as much per capita upon the colored people as upon the white people. Notwithstanding the small income of the people of the South as compared with the Northern and Eastern States, the South is forgetting that, and doing all anyone could expect of it to improve the condition of the Negro in that section.

Why does anyone wish to disturb that situation? The Negroes in the South are not asking, the intelligent Negroes do not want social race equality, which is involved in the program, and we all know it. They do not want to have such a thing as that forced on them. They are proud of their own race. Some of the northern folk do not understand that. They have not the same type of Negro in the North as in the South, constituting the great majority of the Negro race in this country. The Negroes are proud of their race, they are educating their children, they are seeking to improve their condition economically and otherwise.

Why not let us alone? The Negroes of the South are not appealing to anyone. There is no society for the advancement of the colored race in the South, as there is in the North—a political organization. They are going along making progress, are proud of their race, and we feel great interest in them.

All we ask the northern people to do is to let us alone. If the northern people have trouble in their own States, let them settle it within their legislatures, settle it locally, where the people understand their situation, and where they have their court procedure.

We know the trouble that occurred in some States during the prohibition era. A great many States had adopted prohibition for themselves, and then there arose a clamor among enthusiasts that it should be put on States which did not want it. That view prevailed, and what was the result? Did that advance the cause of temperance? Did it advance the cause of effective prohibition? No; it did not. On the contrary, it broke down, weakened, and destroyed sentiment which had been built up by temperance advocates over a long period of years, because compulsion in a national way was put upon the States of this Nation.

Why should not the Senators from the North, from above the Mason and Dixon's line, proceed with their effort to get legislation in the various States where some relief is needed from unfair race practices? There is no use of legislation if there is not an evil, and if there is an evil, there is more chance of regulating it under the police power of the States than there is under the Federal Constitution. No one doubts the right of the States to regulate such an evil.

If there really is a desire to serve the cause of the colored people in the mat-

ter of employment, if there is a desire to promote them in the matter of social equality with the white people, or intermarriage, whatever anyone wants to do for them, let the States take such action as they may see fit. We are not interfering with that. But I submit, in the interest of fairness and justice, in the interest of the colored people, that we who have been here fighting this measure know them better than any of the Northern people know them or could possibly know them. We have been reared among them, our fathers were reared among them, we understand them. We are trying to help them. We have been helping them all the years since slavery was abolished.

I appeal to Senators. We know the proposed legislation will not pass this week, but some zealous for it may want to bring it up again, or something similar to it. I appeal to them to consider carefully whether a national program of this sort is better than individual State programs applied where conditions demand. If such measures cannot be passed in the States, then I submit the proponents of this measure are going beyond reasonable bounds in coming here and voting to put it on States other than their own States, if their own States do not want it, as shown by the action of their State legislatures.

#### FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION RESCISSION ACT, 1946

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it will be remembered that after the war closed the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses reported a bill for rescission of many of the appropriations which had been made by the Congress for carrying on the war. The appropriations amounted to over \$50,000,000,000.

The bill passed both Houses, but the President vetoed it because of one item concerning USES. The bill was not acted upon by the two Houses after that, until the House passed H. R. 5158. That bill came to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and on February 4 was reported favorably to the Senate by that committee.

The bill as recommended by the committee, with one exception, is precisely the same in form and content as the similarly entitled bill—H. R. 4407—as finally approved by the House and Senate and transmitted to the President, except that it excludes the provision contained in H. R. 4407 for the return to the States of the employment services which were loaned to the Federal Government at the beginning of 1942. The following is a summation of the rescissions provided for in the former and accompanying measures:

| Executive departments and various independent agencies: | Amounts rescinded |
|---|-------------------|
| Cash  | \$2,945,503,585   |
| Contractual authorization                               | 929,961,208       |
| Military Establishment:                                 |                   |
| Cash  | 30,263,923,993    |
| Naval Establishment:                                    |                   |
| Cash  | 14,370,159,964    |
| Contractual authorization                               | 3,276,072,671     |
| Corporate funds   | 1,190,500         |
| Total   | 51,786,811,921    |

The earlier bill, as passed by the House, included provision for the States to resume control of their loaned employment services on the thirtieth day after the enactment of such bill. A more comprehensive provision was substituted by the Senate, and, as finally agreed to by the House and Senate, provided for the return of the employment services to the States on or before the one hundredth day after the enactment of the bill.

The President's objection to H. R. 4407 is because of his opposition to the provision contained therein for the return to the States of their loaned employment services at the height of the period of demobilization and reconversion. His position is made clear in his memorandum announcing that he had not approved the bill, issued on December 22, 1945, and which appears on pages 12547-12549 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 21, 1945.

On January 29, 1946, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 4437 entitled "An act to provide for the return of public employment offices to State operation, to amend the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933, and for other purposes," and that bill is now pending in the Senate Committee on Education and Labor.

The bill as originally presented to the President and the pending bill carries a provision that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall on or before January 3, 1946, submit to the Congress a joint recommendation for revision of the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942, as amended, including but not restricted to recommendations with respect to increases authorized for flying pay, parachute pay, glider pay, submarine pay, and similar special pay and allowances. Inasmuch as January 3 is long past and in order that the departments may have sufficient time in which to make their recommendations as contemplated by the provision referred to, the committee is amending the bill by striking out the date "January 3, 1946," and inserting in lieu thereof the date "February 28, 1946." This is the only amendment recommended by the committee.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. This is what is known as the rescission bill is it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. What it proposes to do is merely to cancel an enormous number of appropriations which are no longer necessary because the war has ended.

Mr. WHITE. I did not know the bill was to be taken up this afternoon and I have had no opportunity of consulting minority members of the committee. Let me ask specifically, is this arrangement satisfactory to the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is.

Mr. WHITE. Then, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5158) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for

the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5158) reducing certain appropriations and contract authorizations available for the fiscal year 1946, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with an amendment on page 39, line 4, after the word "before", to strike out "January 3" and to insert "February 28."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

#### FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 101) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

**MR. CAPEHART.** Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

**MR. ELLENDER.** I yield.

**MR. CAPEHART.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments proposed by me on January 25 to S. 101, the FEPC bill, be printed in the RECORD, and that that may be deemed to be in compliance with the cloture rule as to their presentation for proposing at a subsequent time.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. CAPEHART are as follows:

On page 12, line 13, strike out "(a)."

On page 12, beginning with line 23, strike out all down through line 10 on page 13.

On page 2, line 10, after "United States" strike out all down through the word "State" in line 12.

On page 1, line 6; page 3, line 1; and page 3, line 4, strike out the word "persons" in each case and insert in lieu thereof the word "citizens."

On page 2, line 16; page 2, line 18; page 2, line 21; page 3, line 9; page 3, line 11; and page 3, lines 19 and 20, strike out the word "person" in each case and insert in lieu thereof the word "citizen."

On page 2, line 17; page 2, line 19; page 2, line 23; page 3, line 9; page 3, line 12; and page 3, line 15, strike out the word "person's" in each case and insert in lieu thereof the word "citizen's."

On page 3, line 14, after the word "any" insert the word "citizen."

On page 3, line 25; and page 4, line 9, strike out the word "six" in each case and insert in lieu thereof the word "fifty."

On page 13, line 16, strike out "\$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000."

On page 13, line 17, strike out "one year" and insert in lieu thereof "thirty days."

**MR. HATCH.** Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

**MR. ELLENDER.** I yield to the Senator if by doing so I do not lose the floor.

**MR. HATCH.** I have not heretofore participated in the debate on the pending bill except possibly to ask a question or two. I think, however, that my attitude toward the bill is quite generally known, as I have in no way attempted to conceal my views. I have said, Mr. President, that I cannot support or vote

for Senate bill 101. More than that, I have said that I cannot support and will not support cloture. Some of my friends, both in and out of the Senate, have expressed some surprise at my attitude in this regard. Perhaps therefore I should make a brief explanation of why I assume this position. That I shall endeavor to do, and I shall be as brief as possible.

Mr. President, this measure in its opening paragraph recites:

That the Congress finds—

This is a finding of fact made by the Congress of the United States that conditions in this country are such—

that the practice of denying employment opportunities to, and discriminating in employment against, properly qualified persons by reason of their race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry, foments domestic strife and unrest, deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production, endangers the national security and the general welfare, and adversely affects commerce.

Mr. President, if Congress should pass this proposed legislation in its present form it would adopt the language I have just read as an absolute finding of fact as to the actual conditions which exist in the United States today. If I had no other reason in the world for opposing the bill than that I would vote against it, because I believe such a finding of fact would be false. It is plain, Mr. President, why that finding is set forth in the bill. It is an attempt to justify the exercise by the Federal Congress of the power to enact such legislation by giving color of compliance with the Constitution of the United States. I do not know whether from a legal standpoint, it could have that effect or not, but I know, even if such attempt is made to make the bill constitutional, that no law can justly rest upon a false foundation.

I sat on the bench at one time during my career. I heard many cases without the aid of a jury, and I necessarily made findings of fact and conclusions of law, and in nearly every case the conclusions of law had to be based upon the facts which were found. I am not speaking of myself now as a judge, but I know of no judge in the United States, either State or Federal, who would willfully and deliberately make a false finding of fact in order to render the kind of legal judgment he wanted to make. I do not at all challenge the motives of those who sponsor this legislation; I do not question their sincerity and good intentions, but as I read this measure and as I view conditions in the United States, if I voted for the bill and made that finding of fact I would be in exactly the same position as a judge on the bench who deliberately made a false finding of fact in order that he might sustain a legal judgment he wanted to make. That Mr. President, of course, I cannot do.

The paragraph refers to discriminations because of race, creed, national origin, and ancestry, placing, perhaps, on the same basis with the color line, which has been mentioned, the question of religious freedom in this country. Mr. President, I do not know of any place in the United States where a man is denied a chance to work on account of

any particular creed to which he may adhere. There was a time when the differences between our religious denominations were such that there may have been discriminations of this kind, and perhaps they exist in some degree in some places today. I do not know. But I know that in the process of the years we have decidedly gotten away from those differences of religion, until, I think, today in America it can be said that we truly have religious freedom, and men are not discriminated against because of their religious views. I would regret deeply to insert in a bill of this kind the statement that in my country differences of religion are such that the welfare of America is jeopardized and the commerce of the Nation is interfered with because men by reason of their religious beliefs cannot secure employment. I simply do not believe that to be true.

It may be that in some sections of the country there is discrimination on the ground of nationality, other than the question of race. If that be true, it is to be deeply regretted. I would do anything I could to remove any such discriminations which might exist. As I shall presently say with respect to the colored race, I believe that when we attempt to force by law tolerance, respect, mutual good will, and such things, we are only aggravating the conditions which we seek to improve. I am eliminating from this consideration of the bill all those things relating to religion, to creed, to ancestry, and to national origin—everything except the question which I consider to be paramount, and that is so-called discrimination in America against the black man.

Mr. President, I am not begging the question. I concede that in this country there is discrimination against the black man. But in making that statement I do not confine it to the South. Discrimination against the colored man can be found in the North. It can be found to some extent in every section in America where the colored man lives, in every State in the Union.

But, Mr. President, even though I agree that such discrimination exists—and I do admit it, and regret it—I cannot agree that it can be cured by an act of Congress. I agree that the opportunities to work are limited for the colored man. I know that there are many places where he cannot secure a job simply because he is a black man. I say that that is a tragedy. It represents a failure of the white man, and to some extent a failure of the black man. But I repeat that it is not a thing that we can cure by law. Equality of opportunity to work, economic equality—yes, political equality—cannot be forced by law.

Perhaps some may be startled when I say that political equality is not enforced by law in America. We come nearer to it than any other nation in the world, but true political equality does not exist in America. Again, that condition is not confined to the South. The lack of political equality exists today in the North, in the East, and in the West. If we are to be truthful and candid we must admit that to be true. Yet we fought a bloody civil war in this coun-



try; we amended the Constitution of the United States; we had the Emancipation Proclamation; and statute after statute was enacted by Congress in an effort to confer political equality. Senators know, and I know, that those attempts have not been altogether successful.

I am not discouraged, although nearly 75 years have passed and that goal has not yet been attained. I believe that eventually, by using wisdom and understanding on both sides, we may approach nearer to true political equality. I mention that only to say this: After all the trials and tribulations, the bloodshed, the laws, and the constitutional amendments, when nearly 75 years have passed and political equality does not truly exist, how can Senators deceive themselves into thinking that by enacting an unconstitutional law we can create economic equality? It may be all right for Senators to deceive themselves if they desire to do so. It may be all right to enact a law declaring that certain conditions exist, and setting up the machinery which the bill would establish, in an effort to force upon American citizens a system of which they do not approve and for which they will not stand, by a law which they will not obey, in the belief that we are helping the situation. If Senators wish to deceive themselves by doing so, let them pass this type of bill. But I for one will not deceive myself, or the people whom I represent, by saying that this bill will do that which I know it will not do.

Mr. President, I have stated that in my opinion the bill is unconstitutional. I think it is. I shall not take the time today to discuss the constitutional phases of the bill; but I wish to say that, in addition to violating some of the fundamental principles of the Constitution itself, I feel that this measure will, if it ever becomes a law, transgress and invade the most sacred American principles contained in the Bill of Rights. I do not believe that we can create freedom of equality or opportunity in one group by transgressing the principles of freedom and equality with respect to other groups. I say that members of the group which this bill is intended to help might well be the ones most seriously injured by a violation of the fundamental principles of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

No, Mr. President; I do not believe that the bill is constitutional. I believe that it transgresses the Bill of Rights. For those reasons I cannot vote for the measure. But I am still not begging the question. Even if the bill were constitutional, even if it did not transgress the Bill of Rights, I would still vote against it. I would vote against it simply because I happen to know—or at least I think I know—of some of the conditions and some of the feelings which exist in certain sections of the country, even though such feelings may represent a minority sentiment. I know how strongly certain of our people feel about legislation of this kind, in sections where the greatest number of the people who would be affected by the bill dwell. It is my judgment—and it is a considered judgment, one which has not been quickly arrived at—that if we should at-

tempt to enforce the principles of this bill in those sections of the country we would create a far worse condition than the one which we are attempting to cure. I do not say that the conditions in those sections of the country are right. I know that they are deplored by many people who live there, and that honest, intelligent men and women are trying their best to cure some of those conditions. I hope that eventually they will succeed.

There are some things that cannot be done by law. There are some things that men will do voluntarily because they are right; but the minute an attempt is made to force them to do even that which is right, they rebel. I know that the proposed law could not and would not be enforced. I believe that if an attempt were made to enforce it in accordance with the language of the bill, it would create antagonisms; it would create conditions which would take many years to cure, and might result in situations which I do not care to discuss today. In short, I can sum up that point in one sentence, namely, that regardless of the good intentions and good motives of every man who believes in this legislation—and I concede them to be good—if this bill were passed and were enforced it would do vastly more harm than good to the very citizens whom it is intended to help.

Believing that, Mr. President, I say again that I cannot support the pending legislation. I do not wish to take much time on this matter, but, I come now to the question of cloture, upon which we shall vote tomorrow. A few days ago I heard one Senator say on this floor that he would always vote for cloture, meaning that he has a hard-and-fast rule on the subject of cloture. I do not have. There are some instances when I would vote for cloture, and there are others when I would not. As the Senator from Maine stated yesterday, I believe there are times when a minority can protect itself against an overwhelming and sometimes ruthless majority only by using every legitimate and available means at hand. A great leader of our own party, Thomas Jefferson, warned more than once of that situation. I believe it was in his first inaugural address that he expressed fear, perhaps, of legislative domination, rather than Executive domination; and I know that he warned then against arbitrary rule by the majority against the minority. He always respected the rights of the minority.

It is true we must have majority rule. But when fundamental rights are involved, when the conditions affect the safety and welfare of a man's own people in his own State, or when he honestly believes that they do—I do not think it is necessary that he be correct in that belief; he does not have to be right, but if he sincerely and honestly believes that the measure is of that importance, I think he is untrue to himself, untrue to his people, and untrue to his State unless he exercises every means he can to protect against what might be the arbitrary and ruthless overriding of the minority by the majority.

So there are times when I believe in free and unlimited debate, even though

it amounts to a filibuster; and when those conditions arise, I will not vote for cloture. I do not think any man who has been in the Senate for any length of time, when he realizes the nature of the questions which this bill presents can doubt the sincerity and the honesty of the motives of those Senators who have stood here, day after day, exercising the rights and privileges which are theirs under the rules of the Senate, in their endeavor to protect their States from what they believe to be an invasion of their rights by a majority. They are sincere and they are honest in those views. Whether they are correct is immaterial. I uphold their right to use the methods of unlimited debate, even to the extent of filibustering, to protect the things in which they believe so strongly; and I would not have a great deal of respect for them if, entertaining those beliefs, they did not do so.

Therefore, I will not vote for cloture.

There is another reason why I will not vote for cloture on this particular bill and under such circumstances as these, and that is the very practical situation. Some Senators have said on the floor of the Senate, "I am opposed to the bill, but I am going to vote for cloture." Mr. President, the situation is that, as has repeatedly been claimed—and probably correctly so, I think—a majority will vote for this measure if it comes to a vote, and that it will carry. Therefore, from my own standpoint and speaking only for myself—every man has a right to form his own opinion, of course—if I were to vote for cloture I would feel that I was voting for the bill itself. I might "kid" myself a little by saying that I was not doing that; but the ultimate fact would remain the same: By my vote on cloture, I would be making it possible to pass legislation to which I am opposed. Mr. President, I simply will not do that. I oppose the legislation and I will oppose it the first place I meet it, and that will be on the vote for cloture. I will vote against cloture.

Mr. President, I think I have said sufficient to enable my position to be understood. I do not think there has been any doubt as to the fact that I am going to vote against the bill and against cloture.

I wish to make it plain that, while there are many other reasons which I have not discussed, I have mentioned only a few of the outstanding ones which prevent me from supporting the legislation.

#### AID FOR STARVING EUROPEAN PEOPLES—DECREASE OF WHITE FLOUR CONTENT OF BREAD

Mr. President, I wish to digress at this point. I desire to mention another matter, one entirely foreign to the subject I have been discussing.

Yesterday afternoon, the President of the United States made an appeal to the American people which dealt with the use of wheat in our flour and the kind of bread we shall use. I see nothing extraordinary in that appeal, in the light of conditions which we know exist all over the world. But, Mr. President, I have been amazed to hear some of the comments which have been made and to read some of the things which have appeared in the newspapers. I have not been too

pleased with what I have seen and heard. Let I be misunderstood as to what I mean when I refer to newspapers, let me say that this morning I examined all the newspapers which I could obtain and which I had time to examine, and I looked at their editorial comment. I find that, without exception, the newspapers editorially support the plea of the President. But I have heard on the radio and I have read statements to the effect that the housewives of America will rise in revolt against using a shade darker flour in making bread. I even heard that it was a grave political mistake for the President of the United States to ask the people of America to make one small, slight—I started to say sacrifice, but I shall not use the word "sacrifice" in that connection—to make a slight concession—"concession" would be a better word to use—in order that we may send some wheat from our storehouse to the starving peoples of Europe.

I was shocked when I heard it said that this would be a political blunder. My God, Mr. President! Have we come to such a pass in the United States that the President cannot make an appeal for the hungry and the starving without being besmirched with the taint of party politics or without having someone try to take political advantage of a situation of that kind? I repeat that I was shocked, and I think I say for the people of America that all our people would be shocked if such a construction were placed upon an honest effort to send a little wheat to hungry men, women, and little children. But, Mr. President, I was more shocked when I learned today that there has been introduced in the Congress of the United States, immediately following that appeal of the President, a bill which would prevent our doing it.

I am not reflecting on the House of Representatives. The rules of the Senate forbid me doing so. I am not reflecting on the individual who introduced the bill. I do not know what motives prompted him. But I have on my desk a copy of House bill 5418, which was introduced in the House of Representatives yesterday, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. It reads as follows:

That no grain or flour shall be exported from the United States until (1) it is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture that sufficient quantities of said grain have been distributed to areas of the United States now suffering from shortages of livestock and poultry feeds.

Mr. President, I could wax sarcastic about that. I intend to deal a little in sarcasm, and say that the author of that bill is placing the feeding of chickens above the feeding of human beings. That, however, was not the intention of the author of the bill. In the West we have had serious shortages of grain for our livestock, and in some sections of the country there have been serious shortages of feed for poultry. It is necessary that our livestock and chickens be fed in order to produce food for the purpose not only of feeding ourselves but of feeding peoples in other lands. But that can be done without an act of Congress, and without a proposal such as this, which, if enacted into law, would cause us to be ridiculed all over the country. The

bill provides that before we may export grain to starving nations we must first have enough for our own livestock and our chickens. That is what the bill says, but it does not express the temper of the American people or the temper of the Congress. We will find means to feed our livestock in the West. It will not be long before grass will begin to grow, and then we will have feed for our livestock. There will be feed for poultry, and there will be a sufficient quantity of food to enable us to send at least some of it to the victims of the war.

I continue reading from the bill:

(2) It is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture that there are sufficient supplies of flour to assure the American people of the present amount of white bread.

Mr. President, by an act of Congress it is proposed that before we send one bushel of wheat abroad to keep men, women, and children from starving, we in America must be assured by our Secretary of Agriculture that our bread shall be white.

Mr. President, one could be facetious, but this is not a facetious matter. I know that it is right that we should care for our own. I want to care for our own, but we are caring for our own. No person in America hungers today.

I happened to pick up in the reading room a copy of today's issue of the Washington Daily News which contains two pictures. I wish those pictures could be printed in the RECORD itself. The following statement appears under the pictures:

These two pictures taken from thousands in the files of UNRRA's Washington office show why President Truman has asked Americans to reduce their diets 800 calories a day, to get along with 30 percent less beer and 25 percent less booze.

Mr. President, I wish to look at this bill again. I am sure it has no reference to booze or to beer. It relates only to livestock and poultry food and white bread.

I continue reading from the language appearing under the pictures to which I have referred.

It's to keep millions of youngsters like the little Yugoslavian fellow at left from slowly starving to death this year. It's to bring healthy round cheeks and big smiles like that on the Greek youngster, at right, so contentedly nibbling away on a hunk of bread—brown bread. Other pictures on page 26.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may make a 3-minute statement on the FEPC?

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator permit me to finish what I was about to say?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I shall be through in a moment.

Mr. President, I do not wish to say anything relating to the sacrifices which the people of this Nation made during the war. In every home where death has come—and it has come in thousands of homes—as great sacrifices have been made as human beings can make. For the sacrifices our brave men and their families have endured I, as an American, pay the highest honor and tribute which I can pay to them. But, aside from

those sacrifices, this country has not sacrificed. It is true that we have an unparalleled national debt. It is true that at the present time we are confronted throughout the country with labor difficulties, and that strikes are taking place. It is also true that the period of reconversion through which we are now going presents many problems. It is a serious matter to convert from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy. I know there are serious questions of many kinds facing this country today, as well as problems which are perplexing and bewildering. We do not have the answers to them all.

Some men are born to be pessimists. We hear complaints about this and that, and fault finding with the conditions of unemployment in America, as well as many other things which have been discussed in the Senate during the past several days. There is much which can be done to improve conditions in this land of ours. But, Mr. President, in America men, women, and children are not going hungry. We are not starving. There is work in America for every man who wants a job. Our cities have not been bombed. Our industries have not been destroyed. Our merchants are not bankrupt. Our fields have not been devastated. Marching armies have not swept across our land. Our homes have not been violated, and our women have not been desecrated.

Mr. President, I thank God I live in the United States of America, and not boastfully, but humbly and gratefully, I am thankful for America and her free institutions. I wish to say that I do not want to give merely out of our surplus; I do not want to send to Europe only the wheat which we do not need to feed our livestock and our poultry and which we do not need to keep our bread white. I am willing to share with the starving nations of the world out of the abundance which Providence has given to us as a nation, and to us as a people.

Mr. President, I wanted to say these words because I was shocked and amazed at the reception received by the President's appeal that we send to hungry and starving peoples a little of our grain, that we let our bread be a little less white, perhaps a shade darker, which perhaps would be more beneficial to our health. I think the American people will be glad to respond to that call of the President.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on February 7 I offered two amendments to Senate bill 101, the bill now under discussion. I should like very briefly to explain the amendments.

Senate bill 101 contains subject matter seeking to solve a problem which has concerned me greatly for some years, and which in the past 2 years has been brought many times to my attention in various ways.

In 1943 a New York newspaper published an article about race riots in Boston. I was at that time the Governor of Massachusetts, and the report upset me greatly, because I was proud of the way we got along with each other in



Boston. We are a truly metropolitan city, with citizens of many different racial origins and diverse religious beliefs. But as there was trouble we did not know of, I was determined that we should know of it. So I appointed a commission of five distinguished citizens of different racial and religious beliefs, and asked them to ascertain the truth of the charges. They investigated carefully, and reported. The charges did have some basis in fact, but were greatly exaggerated. At that time I requested that the Commission continue its work. It has done so, and is still functioning.

The recommendations of the Commission from time to time emphasizes education and understanding as the greatest means of eliminating racial and religious jealousies. Education takes time, patience, and much careful work. In the meantime, in the difficult period through which we are passing, we want to do our best to make each one of us conscious that we each have a share of responsibility for improving conditions. Senate bill 101 is an effort to make us feel that consciousness. It contains a statement of the problem, and contains clauses providing compulsory means of enforcing the views of the Commission set up under the bill.

Last year New York and New Jersey enacted laws similar to the bill we are considering, and a similar bill failed in Massachusetts by one vote.

My amendments go to the enforcement provisions of the bill. As I have said, I believe what we need most is education. That ultimately provides the solution, without using any compulsory means. But if in the meantime we take some other steps, we want to be sure we make them as helpful as possible.

My first amendment is taken from the New Jersey act. It provides, in brief, that if the Commission shall determine, after investigation into the complaint that has been brought before it "that probable cause exists for crediting the allegations of the complaint, it shall immediately endeavor to eliminate the unlawful employment practice complained of by conference, conciliation, and persuasion. Neither the Commission nor any officer or employee of the Commission shall disclose what has transpired in the course of such endeavors."

In other words, the first effort of the Commission would be to persuade the person against whom a complaint was filed to change his attitude, and to do it without publicity, off the record, as we say in Government circles.

If that should not work, and there was a hearing and a finding and an appeal for enforcement, my second amendment would give the circuit court a chance to hear further evidence if it believed there was a real reason for the evidence not having been presented to the Commission. The important words in the amendment are:

If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Commission, its member, or designated referee, agent, or agency, the court may take

and consider such additional evidence. The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive.

Then it proceeds further in legal language.

This procedure is similar to that employed at the present time under the laws now in force with relation to the National Labor Relations Act and under the Federal Trade Commission, except that the court and not the Commission, as provided in those acts, hears the additional evidence.

The purpose of the amendment is to give the court which has not done the preliminary work a better opportunity to be as impartial as possible, and to bring a new mind to the problem that is under consideration.

I hope that if cloture prevails and the bill is considered, these amendments will be adopted. I believe they improve the language of the bill, and make its purpose clearer and the fulfillment of its objectives more nearly possible; but its final objective will be accomplished only by greater education. On that I feel confident there is reasonable agreement.

#### BRITISH GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF AMERICAN BUSINESS SECURITIES

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, recently I made a statement for the RECORD concerning the ownership by the British Government of certain segments of American private enterprise. I pointed out that the United Kingdom, that is, the Government itself—not the citizens or nationals of the United Kingdom, but the British Government—was the owner of American stocks in more than a hundred American business corporations, with a total value in excess of three-fourths of a billion dollars.

In some cases this ownership represents a controlling interest. In most of the larger corporations, such as General Motors, American Locomotive, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, Radio Corp. of America, Celanese Corp., United States Steel, Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., American Telephone & Telegraph, and other similar corporations, the ownership represents, of course, much less than a controlling interest.

I have been somewhat amazed that the disclosure with respect to the British ownership of American business enterprises failed to arouse more public interest. Apparently, however, many people misunderstood my statement in this connection, because I have received numerous inquiries asking if these securities were not owned by British citizens and nationals rather than the British Government. I have noticed editorial comments stating that the securities referred to were owned by British nationals and citizens. That, however, is not a fact. The securities involved were expropriated from British citizens and nationals by the British Government, and were paid for in pound sterling. The British Government has complete ownership, control, and all voting rights. No individual has any claim, right, title, or interest in these stocks. The British Government is the sole, direct, and absolute owner of these stock interests in Amer-

ican private companies. The management of several of these companies has expressed considerable anxiety with respect to this movement into American private business by the British Government.

Presently, these American corporate securities have been pledged by the British Government to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as collateral against a \$390,000,000 loan made by that agency to the British Government in July 1941. The net balance remaining due on the loan after crediting accumulated reserves from dividend payments is approximately \$240,000,000. At existing market values the British Government has a dollar equity in these stocks exceeding half a billion dollars. The stocks are so widely distributed and the volume of shares being traded in at the present time are such that the stocks can be liquidated without a depressing effect upon the market. If the British Government will convert these paper assets into usable American dollars which they so badly need, the presently proposed Treasury loan can be reduced by more than half a billion dollars. Liquidation of the loan would not only give the British Government a half-billion-dollar equity, but it would remove this foreign government ownership from American business and serve to protect our traditional system of private enterprise.

I suggest that we exercise ordinary practical business judgment and request the British Government to convert these assets, which are now frozen as collateral against the RFC loan, into liquid dollar exchange, before we further burden the American people with the presently proposed Treasury loan. Recently, I appealed to the State Department to give consideration to such action in their negotiations with the British financial representatives. In that connection I should like to place in the RECORD a letter from Under Secretary Dean Acheson, dated January 21, 1946, and my reply thereto of February 7, 1946.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, January 21, 1946.

The Honorable E. H. MOORE,  
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MOORE: I refer further to your letter of November 30, 1945.

You indicate in that letter your belief that the United Kingdom should be required to liquidate the collateral behind the Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan, and that the line of credit which it is proposed to extend to that country should be reduced by the United Kingdom's equity in the collateral, or approximately \$500,000,000. For this position you advance two chief arguments. First, that such action would provide the United Kingdom with dollars and thus relieve that country's dollar shortage; secondly, that it is unhealthy for foreign governments to own large segments of American enterprise.

May I point out, with reference to the first argument, that among the stated purposes of the proposed line of credit are the following:

1. "To assist the United Kingdom to meet transitional postwar deficits in its current balance of payments."
2. "To help the United Kingdom to maintain adequate reserves of gold and dollars."

As you are aware, the British liquidated a considerable portion—approximately \$4,500,000,000—of their foreign investments during the war, including some of their investments in the United States. Further liquidations are contemplated in connection with accumulated sterling balances. In view of these facts, I would very much doubt the wisdom of requiring the British to go still further and liquidate the Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan collateral. While it is true that the proceeds would help the British meet their current deficit, the income which the assets in question are presently earning—and which was taken into account in estimating their anticipated balance-of-payments deficit—would be lost. The result would be that in the long run the difficulties which the British are encountering in balancing their international payments would be increased.

I am convinced, moreover, that if the United Kingdom is to be able to cooperate in the financial and commercial policy of this Government, it must be permitted to retain foreign assets which can be quickly converted into liquid international reserves. I believe that the ownership of such assets is of the utmost importance to the financial stability of the United Kingdom and to the maintenance of confidence in the pound sterling. It is probably as inadvisable in international finance as it is in domestic to insist that a prospective borrower liquidate and consume all of his assets before he is granted financial assistance.

With regard to the ownership of shares in American enterprises by foreign governments, the securities in question were, as you know, originally owned by individual British subjects and were vested by the British Government when the Government was attempting to mobilize the United Kingdom's foreign assets for war purposes. I have no reason to believe that these assets will not eventually be returned to private ownership, though possibly not to the original owners. It may be pointed out, moreover, that except for the British owned or controlled insurance companies (and possibly some small or unimportant enterprises) the share ownership involved represents only minority holdings, in no case approaching control.

The whole question of the conditions under which foreign persons or governments are permitted to own, or exercise the rights of ownership in, American business enterprises is, of course, one for the Congress to determine. May I be permitted to suggest, however, that this is a highly involved issue which should be decided on its own merits and which has no necessary connection with the proposed line of credit. The problems which arise in connection with this matter would exist regardless of the extension of the line of credit, and would exist, moreover, with respect to other governments than that of the United Kingdom.

I hope that the foregoing satisfactorily answers the questions you raise in your letter. I shall be pleased, however, to consider any other points you may wish to bring up in connection with this matter.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON,  
Acting Secretary.

FEBRUARY 8, 1946.

HON. DEAN ACHESON,  
Under Secretary of State,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ACHESON: I have yours of January 21 with further reference to my letter of November 30, 1945, in which the suggestion was made that the existing RFC loan to the British Government should be liquidated in connection with the granting of the presently proposed Treasury loan.

You suggest two reasons why the State Department would not favor such procedure. First, that it would weaken the economic position of the United Kingdom and therefore such action would be contra to the policy announced with respect to the presently proposed Treasury loan; and, second, that except for the British owned or controlled insurance companies and possibly some small or unimportant enterprises, the share ownership of the United Kingdom in American enterprises represents only minority holdings and thus presents no practical economic danger to American interests. You also express the confidence that these holdings will eventually be liquidated and acquired by individual investors.

You premise your first proposition on the statement that if the United Kingdom is to be able to cooperate in the financial and commercial policy of this Government, it must be permitted to retain foreign assets which can be quickly converted into liquid international reserves. This is exactly the objective sought to be reached by the liquidation of the paper assets now owned by the United Kingdom in the United States. The pressing need of dollar exchange for the United Kingdom in the United States at the present time is the motivating philosophy behind the proposed Treasury loan. Liquidation of the United Kingdom's paper assets is in complete accord with such policy. You suggest that it is inadvisable to insist that the British Government as a prospective borrower liquidate and consume all of its assets before it is granted financial assistance. The analogy is not applicable. There is no suggestion that the British Government consume these assets. The suggestion is that they merely convert them to a liquid usable dollar exchange.

If the British Government should see fit to leave this half-billion-dollar equity on deposit in the United States, either in private or governmental agencies, it would constitute a liquid reserve that would be the best possible stabilizing influence for the pound sterling. Under their present status the securities are frozen as collateral against a comparatively small loan balanced against the presently and probably temporary tremendous value of the securities. The suggestion of liquidation goes much farther than a mere conversion of the paper assets to usable dollars. Under existing conditions the United Kingdom would be the beneficiary of over \$250,000,000 in net profits. Incidentally, the United States would have no taxable share in these capital gains, whereas if the same profits were taken by private owners the interest of the United States would be very substantial. Measured by every financial standard, the liquidation of the British-RFC loan is sound business from the viewpoint of both parties. The market is high. The trading volume is such that the sale of the British-owned shares now could be absorbed by the market without depressing effect. In any case where this could not be done, private investment houses are available at this time. If these securities remain frozen as collateral and if it should become necessary to market them under unfavorable economic conditions, the turn-over volume might be so limited that liquidation of the loan would have a serious depressing effect on the American securities market generally, and certainly under such conditions the United Kingdom will have been deprived of the profit advantages of the present high level of securities generally. These are indeed real hazards to be considered in any plan to assist the United Kingdom to meet its transitional postwar deficits in its current balance of payments, or to help the United Kingdom maintain its adequate reserves of gold and dollars.

Your second premise seems to be predicated on the belief that the ownership of a foreign

government in American private enterprise, so long as such ownership represents a minority interest, is not necessarily an unhealthy situation. Such view is contrary to the American system of private enterprise and a denial of our constitutional form of government. The American principle that any government should be excluded from the ownership of our private enterprise is as seriously breached by the ownership of a single share as it would be if this or any other government should acquire a controlling interest. Only the effect of the ownership would be different. Our revulsion to government partnership with private interest would be as great in either case.

You express complete confidence that these assets will eventually be returned to private ownership. May I suggest that we be realistic enough to understand that the United Kingdom has seen fit to adopt a socialist government that believes in nationalization of business and industry? In view of that fact, I am unable to share your placidity. Assuming, however, that we may expect the United Kingdom to pay off the present RFC loan and thereafter offer these securities to either American or British private investors, the stability of the American securities market becomes subject to the judgment, whim, or caprice of the British financial agents, who would choose the time and manner of disposing of these securities. Conceivably, these securities could be marketed at a time and in a manner wholly advantageous to the international position of the United Kingdom but with disastrous economic effect on the American securities market.

I have noted the very significant remark on page 3 of your letter that the problems arising in connection with this matter, namely, the ownership of American private industry by foreign governments exists with respect to other governments than that of the United Kingdom. It will be greatly appreciated if you will advise me what other foreign governments and the extent to which they have acquired and now own securities or other forms of tangible or intangible assets in the United States.

There are some who believe that there are sound and convincing social and economic arguments to support approval of the recently negotiated Treasury loan to the United Kingdom. Personally, I am in considerable doubt on this issue. Certainly the liquidation of the existing British-RFC loan would make available to the United Kingdom over \$500,000,000 of its own money and would be sufficient to furnish substantial temporary assistance in meeting current postwar deficits in the United Kingdom's balance of payments. If there are sound arguments for approval of the proposed Treasury loan, our failure to suggest to the British the desirability of liquidating the RFC loan in order that they may make available to themselves this large dollar equity which the British already have in the United States, in large measure nullifies the effectiveness of such arguments.

Yours very truly,

E. H. MOORE.

#### EXPORTATION OF LUMBER FROM THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. On Wednesday, February 6, I addressed the Senate on the matter of the export of lumber from the United States to foreign countries, and pointed out at that time that, according to a press release from the Civilian Production Administration, they had set up a quota for export of Ameri-



can lumber amounting to 225,000,000 board feet for the first quarter. If that were followed out for the four quarters of the year—and we have reason to believe it will not be—it would mean the exportation of more than a billion feet of lumber from the United States during a period when there is a most critical housing shortage in all sections of the United States.

I inquired of the Civilian Production Administration for some figures relating to the export of lumber during the year 1945. I find, on obtaining the figures, that for January 28,000,000 feet in round figures, were exported; in February, 32,000,000 feet; in March, 29,000,000 feet; in April, 26,000,000 feet; in May, 30,000,000 feet; in June, 24,000,000 feet; in July, 38,000,000 feet; in August, 44,000,000 feet; in September, 41,000,000 feet; in October, 42,000,000 feet; in November, 39,000,000 feet; and in December, 49,000,000 feet, or a total of something over 427,000,000 feet for the year 1945.

Under the quota set up by the Civilian Production Administration in the first two quarters of this year we will export more than we exported during the entire year of 1945.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that, taking a figure of approximately 10,000 board feet as the necessary amount for building one home, the lumber exported under the quota prevailing, if continued for a full year, would be sufficient to construct more than 100,000 homes in the United States. If there were no other way of meeting some of the problems abroad perhaps an excuse could be given for the export of this lumber. The fact remains, however, that there are lumber resources in Europe, including those of Germany, which could be called upon to meet the European situation, and there is lumber in the Philippines which, provided the sawmill facilities are available, could meet the requirements in the Pacific area.

We also asked for some figures as to where this lumber was going, and I shall take just a few moments of the Senate's time to read some of the figures into the RECORD. Taking now only the 3 months since September, because VJ-day came in September, we find the following:

To Canada, there was exported from the United States, in October, 5,249,000 board feet; November, 5,710,000 board feet; December, 4,539,000 board feet.

To Mexico, in October, 1,253,000 board feet; in November, 892,000 board feet; and December, 1,363,000 board feet.

To Cuba, in October, 1,705,000 board feet; November, 2,053,000 board feet; and December, 1,506,000 board feet.

There are some other countries with lesser amounts.

We come to the United Kingdom. In October, 20,247,000 board feet; November, 11,141,000 board feet; and December, 29,310,000 board feet.

To the Netherlands: October 1,100,000; November, 622,000, and December, 613,000.

To Palestine and Trans-Jordan: In October, 3,898,000, and in November 2,795,000 board feet.

Mr. President, I ask that the complete list of figures be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Sawmill products (this includes all lumber exports)*

| 1945:                      | Feet       |
|----------------------------|------------|
| January.....               | 28,250,000 |
| February.....              | 32,041,000 |
| March.....                 | 29,820,000 |
| April.....                 | 26,117,000 |
| May.....                   | 30,851,000 |
| June.....                  | 24,148,000 |
| July.....                  | 38,196,000 |
| August.....                | 44,280,000 |
| September.....             | 41,446,000 |
| October.....               | 43,590,000 |
| November.....              | 39,429,000 |
| December.....              | 49,229,000 |
| Canada:                    |            |
| October.....               | 5,249,000  |
| November.....              | 5,710,000  |
| December.....              | 4,539,000  |
| Mexico:                    |            |
| October.....               | 1,253,000  |
| November.....              | 892,000    |
| December.....              | 1,363,000  |
| Cuba:                      |            |
| October.....               | 1,705,000  |
| November.....              | 2,053,000  |
| December.....              | 1,506,000  |
| Trinidad and Tobago:       |            |
| October.....               | 893,000    |
| November.....              | 320,000    |
| December.....              | 460,000    |
| Curacao:                   |            |
| October.....               | 623,000    |
| November.....              | 422,000    |
| December.....              | 50,000     |
| Venezuela:                 |            |
| October.....               | 623,000    |
| November.....              | 1,702,000  |
| December.....              | 786,000    |
| United Kingdom:            |            |
| October.....               | 20,247,000 |
| November.....              | 11,141,000 |
| December.....              | 29,310,000 |
| Netherlands:               |            |
| October.....               | 1,100,000  |
| November.....              | 622,000    |
| December.....              | 613,000    |
| Greece:                    |            |
| October.....               | 7,000      |
| November.....              | 5,719,000  |
| December.....              | N. e. s.   |
| Palestine and Transjordan: |            |
| October.....               | 3,898,000  |
| November.....              | 2,795,000  |
| December.....              | None       |
| India and dependencies:    |            |
| October.....               | 835,000    |
| November.....              | 712,000    |
| December.....              | 622,000    |
| Ceylon:                    |            |
| October.....               | 442,000    |
| November.....              | 503,000    |
| December.....              | 459,000    |
| Australia:                 |            |
| October.....               | 190,000    |
| November.....              | 1,093,000  |
| December.....              | 489,000    |
| Union of South Africa:     |            |
| October.....               | 2,401,000  |
| November.....              | 3,194,000  |
| December.....              | 345,000    |

These were the substantial countries. Peru had a good bit in December, 2,000,000 feet. Ireland, France, Chile, Liberia, Libya, Egypt were big distributors but didn't compare with the above.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say that from all sections of the United States comes the same information respecting the very critical housing shortage. Particularly it is adversely

affecting the veteran returning home after service overseas. We have heard discussed in both Houses of Congress, and in the public press, the possible necessity, in order to prevent increased inflation, of establishing very rigid controls in the matter of housing.

It is, I think, rather elementary that unless we can build new homes and increase the number of homes, we of course have a greater demand than we have a supply, and when we have such a situation in housing, just like in any other commodity, we have a highly inflationary condition. Yet, while the national administration is talking about the necessity—and it may be necessary—of setting up rather rigid controls over housing, at the same time it is permitting the export of lumber from this country at this critical period on a basis that will amount to more than 1,000,000,000 board feet of lumber. I think the administration should take immediate cognizance of the situation, and, before coming to Congress and suggesting other remedies, it should forthwith bring to a stop this exportation of lumber.

#### FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 101) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] I send to the desk amendments to the pending FEPC measure, and ask that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, but that it be printed in the RECORD, and that the printing of the amendment in the RECORD be considered to be a compliance with the rule concerning the offering of amendments after cloture.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment will be received, printed, lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. EASTLAND are as follows:

On page 1, line 7; on page 2, lines 9, 17, 20, and 24; on page 3, line 5; and on page 12, line 20; insert after "origin", the following: "membership or nonmembership in or affiliation or nonaffiliation with any labor union."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, membership or nonmembership in or affiliation or nonaffiliation with any labor union, or ancestry."

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two amendments which I proposed for myself, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to Senate bill 101, the FEPC bill, be printed in the RECORD, and that that be considered to be a compliance with rule XXII so far as offering amendments after cloture is concerned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. BALL (for himself, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. MORSE) are as follows:

On page 3, line 25, strike out the word "six" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty-five."

On page 4, line 9, strike out the word "six" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty-five."

On page 9, line 2, strike out the words "National Labor Relations Board" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Federal Trade Commission: *Provided, however,* That the findings of fact by the Commission shall be conclusive only when supported by substantial evidence."

On page 9, line 15, strike out the words "National Labor Relations Board" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Federal Trade Commission: *Provided, however,* That the findings of fact by the Commission shall be conclusive only when supported by substantial evidence."

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has been very courteous to all of us today in yielding. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Louisiana may have the floor upon the convening of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Louisiana will be considered as having the floor when the Senate convenes tomorrow.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Civil Engineer Joseph F. Jelley, Jr., to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, to continue while serving as Deputy Chief of Civil Engineers, United States Navy, and the Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

George E. Allen, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a term of 2 years from January 22, 1946.

#### CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. At the request of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, we may consider the Executive Calendar, first passing over that part of the calendar dealing with the promotions in the Army, and beginning with the nomination of Henry A. Mulligan to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed, as in executive session, to consider the nominations beginning with that to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar following those in the Army.

#### RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry A. Mulligan, of New York, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a term of 2 years from January 22, 1946.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HATCH. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### RECESS

Mr. HATCH. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, February 9, 1946, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 8 (legislative day of January 18), 1946:

##### IN THE NAVY

Civil Engineer Joseph F. Jelley, Jr., to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for temporary service, to continue while serving as deputy chief of civil engineers, United States Navy, and the Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 8 (legislative day of January 18), 1946:

##### RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Henry A. Mulligan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a term of 2 years from January 22, 1946.

##### POSTMASTERS

###### CALIFORNIA

John G. Walsh, Auburn.  
Pansy Lockett, Calimesa.

###### FLORIDA

Josephine Blondheim, Atlantic Beach.  
Ethel Godbold, Gifford.  
Thornton B. Mills, Summerfield.

###### ILLINOIS

Dwight C. Beatty, Galesburg.  
Martha Ramsey, Oak Forest.

###### KANSAS

Mary Fanny Brown, Hardtner.  
Helen G. Noel, Muncie.

###### LOUISIANA

Joseph M. Wilbanks, Deville.  
Fred F. Duhon, Garyville.  
John H. Henry, Melrose.  
Moise E. Chenevert, Plaquemine.

##### MAINE

Wilfrid L. Spruce, Milford.

##### MISSOURI

Dorothy B. Bohr, Easton.  
Bernadine M. Dickherber, Old Monroe.

##### MONTANA

Eleanor H. O'Connor, Livingston.

##### NORTH CAROLINA

Ella M. Felton, Macclesfield.

##### NEBRASKA

Jeanette Reinmiller, Staplehurst.  
Pauline N. Sweet, Wood Lake.

##### OHIO

Mabel Stone, Empire.  
Mark Emerson Allen, Highland.  
LaMar L. Hahn, Malinta.  
Pauline D. Tussing, Pataskala.  
Augusta A. McPherson, Rockland.  
Earl C. Davis, Trimble.  
Ruth W. Scott, Vienna.  
Watson S. Rice, West Farmington.  
Glenn D. Heuberger, Wharton.

##### OKLAHOMA

Mary F. Cavender, Porum.

##### OREGON

Bryan Dieckman, Myrtle Creek.

##### TENNESSEE

Clyde C. Buck, Armathwaite.  
Flora B. Williams, Buena Vista.  
Ervin M. Peters, Clarkrange.  
Martha S. Bass, Gordonsville.  
Raymond E. Scott, Scotts Hill.

##### TEXAS

Henry C. Martin, Easterly.  
Blanche Schimmelpfening, Helotes.  
Livy Atwell, Hutchins.  
Clarence B. Keeney, Whitharral.

##### WISCONSIN

Bessie L. Severson, Couderay.  
Violet M. Whit, Iron Belt.  
Stanley Jasicki, Weyerhaeuser.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our refuge and strength, we praise Thee at the altar of our hearts. Life holds no motive for stimulating goodness in man, like unto the divine love which moves in quiet calm. Help us to discern beneath every rough exterior something good, something noble. Unto those multitudes that travel the weary rounds of care and hardship, grant them the sanctuary of hope and promise.

O command Thy blessings upon those rich forms of freedom—home, religion, and industry. Grant that we may protect and maintain them with an increasing sense of devotion. As patriots, we would remember our providential past, which was inspired in individual liberty and individual self-reliance. O help us to keep this inheritance in our hearts, believing that in many and in unexpected ways Thou wilt make our work fruitful and bring it to a fine consummation; so grant it, blessed Lord.

O compassionate Father, the light behind the shadows, the love behind the sorrows, shine forth upon the pathway of our most honored Member who has



lost the companion of his years. By the very hush of Thy presence, soothe his aching heart and give him peace. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### THE LATE MRS. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I know every Member of the House grieves with Mr. DOUGHTON, who lost his wife today. She died here in Washington. Knowing your sympathy and knowing your love for Mr. DOUGHTON, I thought you would appreciate my so advising you.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I just want to say a word. Our hearts go out to Mr. DOUGHTON and his family in this solemn hour. They lived in the same building with us, and we all loved Mrs. Doughton. I never met a finer Christian lady. Her death is a loss to the country as well as to the State of North Carolina.

May God bless her distinguished husband and all the other members of her sorrowing family.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add to the sentiment just expressed here by our distinguished colleague from Mississippi. I was fortunate to know Mrs. Doughton well. She was a lovely woman in every sense of that word. Everyone who knew her, in her home, in her community, and even where she lived temporarily and made friends, was acquainted with her fine characteristics and her lovely character. The great influence which she exerted for good in North Carolina and wherever she moved will never abate in this world, and her contribution to the success of her splendid husband, our distinguished colleague, Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, can never be measured. The love and affection which she bestowed upon her loved ones and her acquaintances has made this world a better place in which to live and has been a great contribution to the attainments of her distinguished family. The North Carolina delegation is deeply grieved and our immeasurable sympathy is extended to our beloved colleague and his whole family.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved to hear of the passing of Mrs. Doughton. For 10 years I served as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means under the leadership of her dis-

tinguished husband, and on many occasions I met Mrs. Doughton. We are all proud of BOB DOUGHTON. As we see him in this Chamber at his age, carrying on in his dynamic manner, it is an inspiration to all of us to follow his example of devotion to duty, with virility of mind and body at his age.

Those of us who see that can look behind it, and those of us who knew Mrs. Doughton know of the very important part she has played in his life. A good wife is an example and an inspiration to any man. In the life of BOB DOUGHTON, Mrs. Doughton has been his inspiration, going with him through time in his troubles and trials and tribulations and helping him to carry on in his successes.

As previous speakers have said, Mrs. Doughton was a lady of noble character. She loved God. I do not like to use the phrase "a God-fearing person." To me "a God-loving person" is the best phrase to use in relation to any person who has lived a fine and noble religious life, no matter what his or her religion might be. I know that her soul will meet the seal of approval of the Great Judge of all. My deepest sympathy is extended to my valued friend, BOB DOUGHTON, in his great loss and sorrow.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ENABLING BILL OF 1945

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1152) to effectuate the purposes of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with a House amendment thereto; insist upon the House amendment; and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McGEHEE, HARRIS, and DIRKSEN.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—FIFTH REPORT ON THE OPERATIONS OF UNRRA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

#### To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the fifth quarterly report on operations of UNRRA and on expenditures of funds appropriated by the Congress under the act of March 28, 1944.

With complete victory over the Axis Powers, UNRRA has been able to expand its operations in relieving the ravages of war. The improvement in shipping and the release of supplies have made it possible for UNRRA to ship sharply increased quantities of relief goods to the liberated peoples.

The recent action of the Congress in approving additional funds for the work of UNRRA has assured a continuing flow of needed supplies.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 8, 1946.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD a statement on the cost of living. I have an estimate from the Public Printer and am advised that the statement will run four pages and cost \$208. I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the cost, that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution by the Houston Cotton Exchange and the Board of Trade.

Mr. MCKENZIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a letter from a constituent and in the other a news item from the Evening Star.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a statement by Ed. C. Burris on the Red River. I have an estimate from the Public Printer who states that it will cost \$130. This is a very important statement and I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the cost, that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein a statement by E. B. Wilson before the Rivers and Harbors Commission on the development of Red River as a lateral canal.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therewith a letter from Mr. C. B. Anderson, chairman of the airways committee of the Great Falls Chamber of Commerce, and also a brief in support of the retention of the Army air base at Great Falls, Mont., as a permanent Army air base.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. DOYLE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and include therein an editorial from the Long Beach newspaper.

Mr. CHELF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein a letter which he has sent to the Members of the House.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a copy of a letter from a constituent.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances on four subjects and include some short excerpts.

Mr. RAMEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include an editorial on the labor bill from the Toledo (Ohio) Times.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be granted leave of absence next week on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therewith a statement on the production of wheat in the State of North Dakota.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therewith an address delivered by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, minority leader, last night at the annual Lincoln Day banquet in the city of Washington.

#### SHORTAGE OF BUILDING MATERIALS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SPRINGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### STATE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION FOR INFORMATION PROGRAM

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, here is one that compares favorably with the proposed British loan. According to a press report the President requests \$30,000,000 to finance the State Department for an information program to be conducted abroad—I quote:

An information program designed to disseminate abroad through press, publications, radio, motion pictures, and other media, information about the United States, its people and its policies.

This should take care of most of the OWI crowd.

Now the Bureau of the Budget cut the flood-control appropriation in the civil-functions bill from \$220,000,000 to \$110,000,000. An economy-minded House sustained their recommendations. I shall be anxious to see what consideration the Bureau of the Budget will give this proposed \$30,000,000 for the State Department for a program they state "to

conduct research required for proper formulation of foreign policy."

As far as I am concerned I would rather spend the money to afford relief to the American people from these disastrous and devastating floods that each year destroy their homes and property and upset the economic life of the Nation rather than spend \$30,000,000 in propagandizing abroad.

In view of the action of the House yesterday and its attitude toward necessary and needed flood-control projects I will be anxious to see what position the House will take on this \$30,000,000 propaganda recommendation.

#### SHIPMENTS OF WHEAT

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HOPE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short newspaper article.

#### THE SUGAR SITUATION

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MCGREGOR addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### AMERICAN BORN WIVES DENIED COMMISSARY RIGHTS IN CANADA

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WEICHEL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the late Harry Hopkins, and to include an editorial from his home-town paper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Chicago Daily News of Tuesday, February 5, 1946, entitled "These People Need Help."

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the gentleman from Kansas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 15 minutes today, following the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next following the legislative business of the day and special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

#### THE REPUBLICAN STAND ON THE FEPC BILL

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I notice in today's issue of the Washington Post a story giving some of the high lights of speeches made by various members of the Republican Party at the Lincoln Day dinner here. Of course we all know that if Lincoln were alive today he would be branded a radical by the Republican high command who would certainly not subscribe to his liberal ideals and love of humanity.

I was particularly interested in the speech delivered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE] who said, and I quote:

Republican leaders in both the House and the Senate have worked untiringly in support of the FEPC bill.

Yesterday afternoon the Republican leader of another legislative body declared that the FEPC bill was unconstitutional and that he would vote against its passage.

Now this is all very confusing. Here we have one Republican declaring that the leaders of her party are working untiringly for passage of the FEPC bill and then one of those leaders repudiates the bill.

We have also heard rumors that the minority leader in this body, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] was going to lead a parade of Republicans down to the rostrum to sign the FEPC petition, but I have not seen anyone bowled over in this rush, and venture to say that you would find very few Republican signatures on the petition.



I am looking forward to the day when the Grand Old Party will either admit they are against the bill or will quit pussyfooting and trying to fool the people and join wholeheartedly in support of the bill.

#### CONDITIONS IN POLAND

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the course of events in Poland today have brought about a deterioration of all the rights and privileges that the Allied Governments indicated the people of Poland should possess. I believe the time has come to focus the attention of this House and throw the white spotlight of a truly democratic assemblage on those conditions. The ruthlessness with which a democratic people is being destroyed, and the manner in which political murders are being committed in that traditionally and historically liberty-loving nation is a disgrace and a reflection calling for a reexamination of the situation to which we were a party between Russia and Poland.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

#### DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call attention to an extension I shall place in the Appendix of the Record today dealing with surplus property. If there is anyone who contends that the disposal of surplus property is being done efficiently and in accordance with the intent of Congress, I have been unable to locate such individual.

A great deal of complaint is coming from farmers, veterans, small businessmen, and educational institutions. Certainly there is a reason why such outstanding men as former Senator Guy Gillette would leave the Surplus Property Administration. Great hope was placed in the ability of Mr. Symington, but the press now tells us he is going to another job.

Mr. Speaker, somewhere behind the scenes a muddle is resulting in connection with this surplus property job that constitutes a major scandal. I favor a fearless and searching investigation of the entire program.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an address delivered by Rev. Charles F. Hart, of St. Mary's Parish, Lawrence, Mass., on the Order of St. Augustine.

#### SENATOR WHITE'S SPEECH AGAINST FEPC

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, after listening to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAVAGE] extol that communistic asinine piece of stupid legislation known as FEPC, I thought of another speech made on yesterday on this same subject.

When I came to Congress there was sitting on the Republican side one of the finest men I have ever known, a little dark-haired fellow, a gentleman in every sense of the word, one who was courteous and courageous at all times, a real American. His name was WALLACE WHITE.

On yesterday, in another body, he made one of the greatest speeches against this communistic monstrosity known as the FEPC that has been made on Capitol Hill in 100 years. I hope you will all read it carefully and that the gentleman from Washington may be able to understand it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

#### RIVER AND HARBOR PROJECTS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 510 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 265) to provide for proceeding with certain river and harbor projects heretofore authorized to be prosecuted after the termination of the war. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order consideration of House Joint Resolution 265 and provides for 1 hour of general debate. It is an open rule.

House Joint Resolution 265 aims to repeal certain restrictions contained in the act of March 2, 1945. The original act that we passed provided for the authorization, construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

But there was a restriction as to when that work should be allowed to commence. This resolution aims to strike out this provision:

That no project herein authorized shall be appropriated for or constructed until 6 months after the termination of the present wars.

This resolution will permit the Federal Government to proceed with river and harbor improvements and other activities. I favor the passage of this resolution. However, Mr. Speaker, I feel that even before we start on the construction of river and harbor improvements or the road-building program, every effort should be made to insure that all available materials needed for the construction of homes will receive priority.

Most Members will recall that I called attention to the approaching danger of lack of housing years ago when I urged that some of the departments should be moved out of Washington in order to make it possible for the thousands upon thousands of employees needed to do the work in the Navy and other departments to find a place to live in, as well as to make room for needed enlargements of the various departments.

At that time some Members were under the impression that I was unduly alarmed as to the future. You may remember, also, that 4 years ago some of us advocated increasing appropriations to provide for additional housing. Well, some increase has been made but nowhere near the amount necessary to eliminate the terrific shortage that now exists.

Therefore, I hope, notwithstanding the passage of this resolution, that the Government will not proceed with any work that may in any way interfere with the construction of housing, not only in Washington, but throughout the country. The housing shortage here is acute; but I hope that gradually the number of employees in Washington will be reduced, and should be. There is a housing shortage in nearly every section of our country. There are thousands and thousands of boys returning from across the seas now, and they find it impossible to obtain living quarters.

Therefore I hope the Government, notwithstanding passage of this resolution, will not proceed with any work that can or will interfere with construction of houses for people to live, right here in Washington, and throughout the country. Bad as the situation is here, I have hope that the number of employees here will be reduced, as it should be, in due time. There is scarcely a section of our country with enough houses to go around. Thousands and thousands of our boys are returning from overseas, ready and anxious to establish homes; but they cannot find a place to live.

To begin any public works on rivers and harbors or highways now, which might absorb any materials or any manpower needed to provide homes for Americans, would be manifestly unfair and unjustified.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, though I favor passage of the resolution, I hope and expect that the departments involved will not proceed at once to the construction authorized by the resolution, but rather that they will have an opportunity to investigate the needs for river and harbor improvements and prepare

plans and specifications and make surveys. I hope, also, that no projects will be approved under authority of this resolution except those genuinely needed, and which will aid and benefit the localities involved and the country as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to this rule. I do not believe there is any opposition to the joint resolution. I quite agree with what my distinguished chairman has said as to the necessity for adequate housing. I think the housing problem is the outstanding, paramount problem as far as public works are concerned, and that all other public works, like public buildings in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, should be submerged for the moment if by so doing the housing situation can be improved.

Of course, that has nothing to do with the particular resolution this rule makes in order. These river and harbor projects were authorized, but no money can be spent on them until 6 months after the war. The War Powers Acts are still in force and effect. There are some powers that should be, and must be removed from those acts. I think this provision is one of them.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

IS THIS THE PAY-OFF?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I noticed an Associated Press dispatch in the Washington Star of February 5, which called attention to certain alleged flagrant violations of OPA regulations by the A. & P. chain stores. There are around 6,000 stores in the A. & P. chain system. The news story stated that OPA enforcement and investigating officers had found that the A. & P. stores were short 51,851,251 pounds of sugar in their allowable inventory as of August 31, 1945. And what did Mr. Bowles of the OPA do about it?

Had some small merchant in Fort Wayne or in the State of Minnesota been found short on inventory by the OPA gestapo, or found to have unintentionally overlooked one of the thousands of OPA regulations, it would have brought immediate high-handed prosecution by the agency with a demand for a stiff monetary penalty, which the small merchant could ill afford to pay, to say nothing of headline publicity which the OPA always publishes when it comes to the small businessman. The OPA seldom gives the small merchant a second chance to correct an unintentional violation. But what happened to the A. & P. chain store violation?

The OPA took the A. & P. case to court, and requested the court to issue a permanent injunction to restrain this firm from continuing to violate OPA regulation. And that was the penalty as-

essed against this chain-store system, which is largely owned by one Mr. Hartford, who made the headlines last year for having made a loan, grant, or gift of \$200,000 to Elliott Roosevelt. This loan was charged off as a bad debt by the parties involved in making income-tax returns, as I recollect it. There was no demand by the OPA that this large chain-store system should pay a heavy penalty for violating regulations. The company was set scot free, with the warning: please do not do it again.

What I would like to find out, is the action of the OPA in the A. & P. case a part of the pay-off because of the unbusinesslike loan made by Mr. Hartford to young Roosevelt? This is something that Congress should concern itself with in the interest of protecting honest business in this country.

I feel that many of the activities of the OPA are of serious concern to all of us and to the future welfare of the country. The practice of the OPA in purposely laying traps against small merchants in order to catch them in some unintentional violation of regulations, is contrary to our American system and should not be tolerated. I do not condone willful violations, but, in my opinion, an overwhelming majority of businessmen are honest and strive in every way to comply with laws and Government regulations. They should not be persecuted and we, their Representatives, should not tolerate the continuance of foreign-originated gestapo methods in this country.

In the A. & P. case, I again state that it is up to Congress to find out if the settlement was a pay-off to Mr. Hartford for the loan made to Elliott, or if the case was handled by the OPA on its merits and does this agency give the same consideration to all men engaged in business.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MASON. May I say that some of us thought we had done that when we extended its life before. I am afraid if that is what we are going to depend upon, we are going to be just as badly mistaken as we were then.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman because the law is very clear and the amendments which were adopted by the House have made it clear that the OPA shall function in accordance with customary business practices and permit reasonable and equitable margins of profit. They are not functioning according to the intention of Congress. Therefore, it is up to us, if we want our country to recover and secure the production of necessary goods for the people of the country and stop inflation, to see that the OPA functions in accordance with law or otherwise repeal the law.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Rules, I questioned the wisdom of this matter when the rule was applied for. But after looking into the matter, I withdrew my objection. As a member of the

Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, I had given some thought to this matter, and, like my distinguished chairman, I was apprehensive that we might turn loose a flood of Federal projects at a time when they would conflict with private enterprise getting back on its feet, as we want private enterprise to do. Therefore, our committee recommended to the Congress that no action be taken by the House in the matter of public works that would interfere with the orderly reconversion on a private-enterprise basis. In other words, what we wanted to do, and what I am sure you want to do and the country wants to do, is to have a shelf of public works that will be available to be activated when and if unemployment becomes an acute problem. Of course, we are not going to have any unemployment in this country to amount to anything for at least 2 or 3 years. That was my objection in the beginning. However, after looking into the matter, I have come to the conclusion that this is a meritorious resolution in that it would merely do for rivers and harbors projects what has already been done for the highways of the country through the highway program.

In other words, this resolution would simply make in order these projects which have already been authorized by the Congress in March 1945, when that bill was passed, covering a large number of projects all over the country.

The passing of this resolution does not mean we are going to do what I said I was apprehensive of, that is, go into a gigantic spending spree of Federal funds which would be in competition with private enterprise; but it does mean that money can be appropriated by the Congress if the Congress sees fit to put into operation certain meritorious projects which may be greatly needed in some instances. In the final analysis, the Congress will control that by passing upon appropriation bills.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. PACE. In addition, while there has been no formal declaration by Congress, the wars have been terminated for more than 6 months.

Mr. COLMER. Of course, that is very true. I would like to see the whole thing handled together rather than piecemeal, but I merely wanted to make these observations in view of the fact that I had raised some question about it in the Rules Committee.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. LARCADE. Is it not a fact that work had been stopped on many of these projects and it would be economically sound to resume work on them as soon as possible?

Mr. COLMER. In response to the gentleman from Louisiana, I am sure there are meritorious projects which should be consummated. At the same time I hope that those responsible, both for the appropriation of these funds and for the starting of these projects, will not do that except in extraordinary cases, until there is need for relieving the unemployment



situation which we anticipate will eventually come.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection I am advised that this is the birthday of that outstanding gentleman from Texas, the dean of the Texas delegation and chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, which reported this resolution. I do not know how old Judge MANSFIELD is today, but I do know that he is one of the oldest Members in point of service in the House. I know, too, that he has rendered monumental service to his congressional district, his State, and his Nation. It was my privilege when I first came to Congress to serve on the Rivers and Harbors Committee, which then as now was so graciously and effectively presided over by this great Texan. I doubt if there is a man in the United States who is more familiar with the rivers and harbors of these United States than is Judge MANSFIELD. He is a great asset to his district, to the Congress, and to the country. I felicitate him on this his birthday, and hope for him many more years of useful life and constructive service to the country in the capacity of chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I shall take about 2 minutes.

I see the youngster, chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] in the Chamber. I understand he will today celebrate his eighty-fifth birthday. I hope he will be here with us to celebrate his ninety-fifth birthday. In the splendid health which he now enjoys, I am sure he will be. I know that each and every Member who has known him as long as I have will be only too pleased to have him continue to act as chairman of the great and important Committee on Rivers and Harbors for many, many years, where he will continue to render valuable service to the country.

I have known Judge MANSFIELD well and favorably from the day that he became a member of this House. Not only has he been a great chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee and brought about legislation of vast importance to the Nation; he has ever maintained the liveliest and most intelligent interest in general legislation.

I recall when Judge MANSFIELD, the then Senator Kenyon of Iowa, myself, and a few others were constituted a reception committee to welcome Professor Masaryk, the man who was to become President of Czechoslovakia, and under whose inspired leadership Czechoslovakia set an example to other peoples in democratic government and democratic living. Judge MANSFIELD represents a congressional district that contains a large number of people born in Bohemia, just as I was, and who came to this country seeking freedom and liberty and opportunity, settled in Texas, and have helped to develop their adopted State and country. They have set an enviable example to all in their conduct, their citizenship, and their efficient farming.

I know, for I hear frequently from many of these Bohemians who are now

Americans, that they all hold Judge MANSFIELD in the highest esteem, and properly so, for he has always shown himself to be friendly, broad-minded, and of liberal inclination. For those qualities he is loved as no other man is or can be in that great State. My compatriots deserve a great deal of credit in helping to develop the State of Texas, and especially that congressional district which has given to the country that grand old man, my friend, Judge MANSFIELD.

This gives me the opportunity of talking about another matter that is near and dear to my heart, and which is closely related to Judge MANSFIELD's committee. For many years I have been interested in waterways. Over 50 years ago I advocated the great canal that joins the Great Lakes with the Gulf of Mexico, and which, unlike other canals and waterways, was built and paid for by the city of Chicago at an expense of about \$200,000,000. I believe it is for the best interests of our Nation to have waterways, and I have been advocating for years a national policy of developing the natural water highways.

I understand that the international commission and the engineers have finally agreed on the St. Lawrence Waterway project. I know that Chairman MANSFIELD's committee made an investigation some years ago and looked with favor upon the project then. I hope that the view of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors continues to be favorable when the question comes before the House. As you may know, hearings will be held soon by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on the bill as introduced in the other Chamber. It seems to me wholly proper and desirable that the Senate should act first because the entire proposal involves international agreements with Canada.

I fully appreciate the fact that some interests, for selfish reasons, and for selfish reasons only, are opposed to this great project, which will bring vast benefits, not only to the Middle West but to the whole Nation. For my part, I do not and cannot see why we should be compelled to pay a tribute of 10 to 15 cents for carrying our wheat and corn and other products through New York and other eastern ports when, by completion of this project, the same products could be loaded aboard ship at our Lake ports and move directly from the Great Lakes across the sea, saving time and money.

I hope some of these gentlemen, representing specially privileged eastern interests and some railroads, who have been so unnecessarily alarmed and have opposed construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, and who in the past have enjoyed advantages and benefits they now would deny the Middle West, will show themselves broad enough, big enough, and fair enough, to desist from their opposition. I hope that within a few years we may look back on completion of this great waterways project with the same pride of achievement we now have in viewing the Panama Canal and other great accomplishments in harnessing the forces of nature to the needs of

modern man, with the added satisfaction of knowing we have added to and stabilized the prosperity of the interior of the country.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has consumed 2 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 265, to provide for proceeding with certain river and harbor projects heretofore authorized to be prosecuted after the termination of the war.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 265, with Mr. PACE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD], who celebrates his eighty-fifth birthday today.

It has been my privilege to serve under his leadership on that committee for 13 years. He has always directed the affairs of the committee in a fair, impartial, and generous manner. He has always displayed uniform kindness, no matter on which side of the aisle a Member sat. He is the best informed man in Congress on rivers and harbors. He is an able and distinguished American. It has been a pleasure to serve the Nation, the committee, and the Congress under the wise leadership of such a splendid gentleman as Mr. MANSFIELD. No Member of this body is more respected or held in higher esteem.

I think he is the symbol of what the poet said in a verse which went something like this:

If in life you take the best,  
And in life you see the jest,  
And love you hold;  
Then, no matter how the years roll by,  
No matter how the birthdays fly,  
You are not old.

We pause to pay tribute to him and join unanimously in wishing him many happy returns of this day.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I add this brief word? The distinguished gentleman from Texas likes to put his arm around the younger Members of the House. He is an inspiration to all of us. I have a great affection for him, even as did my late chief and predecessor, Mr. Seger, who served so long with him on the Rivers and Harbors Committee. I salute

him on his anniversary and wish him well.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a great American, the chairman of my Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

It has been my privilege to serve under Judge MANSFIELD now for over 11 years as a member of this great committee of the House. He is one of the finest gentlemen I have ever had the pleasure of sitting with on any committee. I marvel at his great knowledge of the rivers and harbors and the waterway facilities of this country. In my opinion, he is the leading civilian authority in America on these questions.

He is truly a great American and an able, conscientious public servant. I wish for him many, many more years of useful service in this House, together with continued good health and prosperity.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota, [Mr. PITTENGER].

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, there is not anything that gives me more pleasure than to reecho and reiterate the sentiments that have been expressed today in connection with the birthday of one of the grandest men not only in Congress but anywhere in the United States, Judge MANSFIELD.

It was my privilege in 1939 to become a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives. I was a comparative stranger to Judge MANSFIELD at that time, but from that time to this there has been no Member of the House who has been more helpful to me, or more helpful to the people of my district and my State in connection with his official work than has Judge MANSFIELD, chairman of that great committee.

I am very proud and very happy to pay this little tribute to him and to wish him unbounded joy and happiness in the future and many more birthdays such as he is enjoying today.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, it is a very fine coincidence that on today the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee on the anniversary of his birth presents to the House another bill to continue to build great waterway systems in the United States of America for which program he has labored so many years in the Congress of the United States.

It has been my pleasure to serve with Judge MANSFIELD since I have been in Congress as a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee. I know he is one of the most able and one of the best informed men on rivers and harbors and flood-control matters in the Congress of the United States.

On the occasion of a visit last summer to the State of Texas I was impressed to see a monument in honor of Judge MANSFIELD built at the site of one of the great dams constructed under his administration. I remarked at that time

I was glad to see that monument because so often public servants work hard for the public, they labor and slave in the interest of the public and their works are never given attention and appreciated until after they are dead. There was an evidence that the people of Texas and of the United States by erecting a very fine monument in honor of this great builder of waterways, harbors, and dams, Mr. MANSFIELD, had taken note of all the fine things he had done for his State and for his country while he lived.

Mr. Chairman, I desire at this time to join with the rest of my colleagues in extending to our committee chairman the very best wishes for a happy birthday and the hope that he may live 86 years longer.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, one of the first men I met when I came to Congress was JOE MANSFIELD. Our offices were next to each other. I have been associated with him closely from that day to this. For many years I have served on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, of which he is chairman.

I do not hesitate to say that I have never known a finer character in this House or elsewhere. He is rendering one of the greatest services of any man in public life today in helping to develop America's internal resources.

Someone said that:

An old man traveling on a lonely highway  
Came at evening, cold and gray,  
To chasm deep and dark and wide,  
Through which there flowed a sullen tide.

The old man crossed in the twilight dim,  
For the sullen stream had no fear for him.  
He turned when he'd crossed to the other side

And built a bridge to span the tide.

"Old man," said a fellow pilgrim, near,  
"You waste your strength in building here;  
Your journey will end with the ending day,  
You never again will pass this way."

"You've crossed this chasm deep and wide;  
Why build a bridge at eventide?"  
The builder lifted his old gray head,  
"Good friend, in the path I've trod," he said,

"There follows after me today  
A youth whose feet must pass this way;  
This chasm, which was naught to me,  
To that fair-haired lad may a pitfall be.  
He, too, must cross in the twilight dim—  
Good friend, I am building this bridge for him."

Judge MANSFIELD is building not for himself, but for the coming generations of America. They will always owe him a lasting debt of gratitude.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS].

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I am for the rule; I am for the bill, and I am for Judge MANSFIELD. I came down here a few years ago, and the first committee I was assigned to was Rivers and Harbors. I have never regretted it because of his leadership. Judge MANSFIELD's vast knowledge of the problems that committee has to deal with is only exceeded by his thoughtful courtesy, his generous impulses toward neophytes, like myself, all tinged by a wonderful sense

of humor. It makes the world brighter. It makes our work here easier and to me and to all of us I am sure it has been a great privilege and honor and distinction to be associated with a man of his type.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, not least of all because I am happy to be a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors is the fact that there presides over that important committee this young man, 85 years young today, and whose birthday we are observing today. Always sweet and generous, fair and firm is he. Since I came to this Congress as a freshman more than a year ago he has been a great inspiration to me and helpful at all times. I think it might not be inappropriate also to observe that by his side today and always there sits a most unusual secretary, Mr. McGann, who has been secretary of this committee for 44 years. This distinguished legislator and authority on rivers and harbors make an unbeatable team. I just wish to add my felicitations to the distinguished chairman again this year as I did last. It is an honor and privilege for me as a native son of California, and for the California delegation, to extend many happy birthdays.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, on this the eighty-fifth birthday of that fine gentleman the Member from Texas, Judge MANSFIELD, I want to say for the RECORD that he is one of the grandest men I have ever known. I remember well when I first met him after coming to Congress. I was a brand-new Member; I introduced myself to him, and he contributed greatly to making me feel at home and getting me acquainted with procedures in the Halls of Congress. Ever since that time I have deeply appreciated and thoroughly enjoyed the warmth and kindness and friendship of Judge MANSFIELD. His distinguished service in the House, his fine character, and his loyal friendship have won for him the recognition and love of the people of his State and of his colleagues here. On this auspicious anniversary, I say to you Judge MANSFIELD "Happy birthday and lang may your lum reek!"

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I would certainly feel derelict in my duty if I did not add a word to those that already have been spoken on this, the eighty-fifth anniversary of the birth of our beloved chairman, Judge MANSFIELD.

When I came to Congress I was fortunate in being assigned to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and have served on it during my entire service here. I can say with those who have preceded me that I doubt if there is any committee in the House that is presided over with greater dignity or integrity and more understanding and kindness to the members of the committee, without regard to the side on which they may sit, than the committee headed by Judge MANSFIELD. I want to add my word of



appreciation of the fine service that has been rendered by this distinguished American, and I wish for him many, many happy returns of the day.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. At the request of the chairman of the Texas congressional delegation, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WEST], I rise to say that we thank you members of his great committee, and all others, for the high and deserved tribute you have paid him. He is frequently referred to as the youngest and most loved man in our delegation. Along with his fine mind he has a heart and disposition as gentle as a child. Judge MANSFIELD is a very modest man, and probably thinks we may be saying too much, but he deserves everything that has been said about him. No man in the Texas delegation, or for that matter within our great State, is held in higher esteem and affection than Judge MANSFIELD. His ability, his character, and his integrity are the highest. Speaking for the Texas delegation and at their request, I join with all the members of his great committee, both Republican and Democratic, and likewise those of you from all parts of the Nation in wishing for him many, many happy returns of the day.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RODGERS], a member of the committee.

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to embarrass the judge further by adding to the wonderful things that have been said about him, but I do want to endorse all those nice things and to add my congratulations and wish him many happy returns of the day. The country is to be congratulated on having him serve so long and so faithfully on this important committee. As long as it is my honor and pleasure to serve on that committee, I hope I shall continue to serve under my good friend, the judge.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from El Paso has expressed the views of the Texas delegation, but I think I should say to the House that we are making a mistake here today in thinking of Judge MANSFIELD as the oldest Member of the House. Those of us in the Texas delegation who have known him most intimately long ago recognized in him the youngest member of the Texas delegation. We believe that Judge MANSFIELD has all of that spirit of youth and all of that activity that is supposed to characterize a younger man, and he exemplifies all these qualities. He has the virtues of age and the activity of youth.

I am one of those described in the poem quoted a while ago for whom his experience has helped to build a bridge. As one individual and as one of his fellow Texans, I want to express my personal appreciation, and I take this opportunity to say to Judge MANSFIELD that I will never forget the fine things he has done for me, for my delegation,

for the Members of Congress, and for the Nation.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS. I have asked my friend from Texas to yield purely to indulge myself the pleasure of joining with Judge MANSFIELD's colleagues in this tribute to him, and to give expression to the profound affection and admiration which we entertain for him.

Mr. POAGE. I know his colleagues all appreciate the splendid work he has done, and I know it is appreciated all over the country as well.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. I consider Judge MANSFIELD not only one of the ablest Members of this body but one of the grandest men I have ever known. A few years ago the Texas delegation unanimously voted Judge MANSFIELD as the most popular member of the Texas State delegation.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the War Department Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. It is this committee which has the responsibility of appropriating the money which is authorized by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I am doing here today what I believe the chairman of that subcommittee would do if he were not unavoidably absent. I am sure I am echoing the sentiments of every member of my subcommittee from both sides of the aisle when I extend to Judge MANSFIELD our congratulations on his eighty-fifth birthday. Judge MANSFIELD has appeared before our committee many times during the 10 years that I have been a member. He has always presented his case and given us the facts fully. There is no one who has ever sat in this House who had more information with regard to rivers and harbors than Judge MANSFIELD. I sometimes smile when I hear men speak of age terminating the usefulness of a man in the Congress. Had we had a retirement law at 60 or 65 years of age and had Judge MANSFIELD been retired at 60 or 65, the House of Representatives and the Nation would have lost 20 to 25 years of service of an able and distinguished legislator. No one could have taken his place here because no one else has the information and the great fund of knowledge regarding the subject matter with which he has dealt so many years. I have in mind others in this House, such as BOB DOUGHTON and Mr. SABATH. Mr. SABATH was a Member of this House when I was a student in law school at Northwestern University. We have many able men here who are doing a wonderful job and giving great service at an advanced age. I congratulate Judge MANSFIELD on his eighty-fifth birthday; I also congratulate the Nation for having had so able a man here for so many years as Judge MANSFIELD. I again

extend my congratulations and the congratulations of my subcommittee to Judge MANSFIELD on his eighty-fifth birthday. I am sure I echo the sentiment of every member of our subcommittee.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, Judge JOSEPH MANSFIELD is one of the most illustrious of all the good and great who were ever born on the historic hills of West Virginia. In the early morning of his useful life he went from his native State to the promised land of Texas. Although West Virginia will forever regret her loss of this beloved son, she will never cease to rejoice in the brilliant success he has achieved as a Texas Member of the Congress for 29 eventful years. Judge MANSFIELD undoubtedly supplied the poet the inspiration which impelled him to write the following memorable lines:

They who can love when others hate,  
Nor bind the heart with frosts of fate,  
Their feet will go with laughter bold,  
The green roads of the Never-Old.

They who can let the spirit shine,  
And keep the heart a lighted shrine,  
Their feet will glide with fire-of-gold  
The bright roads of the Never-Old.

They who can put the self aside,  
And in Love's saddle leap and ride,  
Their eyes will see the gates unfold,  
To the glad roads of the Never-Old.

Regardless of calendars, birth certificates, or birthdays, our distinguished colleague is still very young. Methuselah lived 969 years. A less famous Biblical character, one Peleg, lived 239 years before he slept with his fathers. And if a man by the name of Peleg could live more than 200 years, one bearing the celebrated, melodious name of MANSFIELD should live at least half a dozen centuries before going to his reward on high. But even this unusual earthly span of life would not fully satisfy my desire for the longevity of this very dear and greatly honored friend. So bless you, Mr. MANSFIELD—

May you live a thousand years,  
Just to keep things lively in this vale of human tears;  
And may I live a thousand, too—no, a thousand less a day,  
For I shouldn't want to be on earth to hear you'd passed away.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would be a traitor to my feelings if I did not say something on this occasion on the birthday of our good friend from Texas, Judge MANSFIELD.

I am one who believes in giving flowers while you live. Do not send them after you have gone and when you cannot smell them. That is my philosophy.

As a freshman Congressman, I want to make this testimony to my good friend Judge MANSFIELD, as was said of Moses, "His eyes are not dimmed or his mental strength abated."

When I first came here I had occasion to meet Judge MANSFIELD. I found him courteous. I found him affable. I found him interesting. Because I was a freshman, that did not make any difference to Judge MANSFIELD. I feel that Judge MANSFIELD is one of the outstanding Members of this House and think he has rendered and is rendering a great public service. I wish we had more men in this Congress of the caliber and character of Judge MANSFIELD to help us solve the pressing problems facing us today. I hope his life will continue for many years to come. He is a great man and a great American.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, it would take a great many minutes for me to say all the nice things I would like to say about my friend and colleague, Judge MANSFIELD, whom I have known for over 10 years in our work together in the Congress. Because of his being one of the most active men, not only in committees but on the floor in Committee of the Whole and in the House, I admire him. He is now a member of two other committees of which I am a member, as well as being chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors; the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. He is active on both those committees and can always be depended upon.

I want to commend the gentleman from Texas on his activity, and his being able to attend these committees at their many hearings as well as attend to his many duties in his office and on the floor of this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF].

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, I wish to go on record by adding a remark or two here at this time in the interest of our beloved friend, Judge MANSFIELD, on this, his eighty-fifth birthday.

I am another freshman Member of the House, and I want everyone to know and understand that he took all of us under his wing, within his heart, and into his confidence. He has been my very dear friend, and I am sure the friend of every young fellow who came to serve in the Seventy-ninth Congress. His counsel has been most helpful, timely, generous, and sincere.

I recall a little verse that this great man's kindness and friendship brings to my mind very forcibly:

Making friends is a lot of fun,  
Shaking hands with everyone;  
Hearing what each has to say,  
As we meet them day by day;  
Swapping smiles and trading cheer,  
Makes us happy while we're here,  
All the joy of life depends,  
Just on the art of making friends.

The sunshine of his smile, the warm clasp of his handshake, and his friendly

attitude establishes him very high in our estimation, esteem, respect, and admiration. As a veteran of War II, I want to take this opportunity to thank the good judge for his support and sympathetic understanding of all measures pertaining to the veterans.

God bless you, Judge. You certainly have taught your young colleagues the art of making friends. "May your leaf never wither and whatsoever you do, may it prosper," and may you be preserved for many, many years yet to come. Texas and the Nation need more men of the caliber, wisdom, and courage of Judge MANSFIELD.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to add my congratulations and best wishes to Judge MANSFIELD on this eventful period in his life. As a junior member of the committee I have been influenced by his genial and friendly attitude.

Judge MANSFIELD did not need to take any lessons from Dale Carnegie on how to make friends and influence people. Dale Carnegie ought to come down and take some lessons from Judge MANSFIELD.

Naturally I am for this resolution and I wish to congratulate the judge for bringing it to the attention of the House in the interest of the Nation, because these projects must go ahead. We need these projects as well as the work for the men they will employ.

I hope I shall have the privilege of serving with Judge MANSFIELD for a long time to come. Congressmen may come and Congressmen may go, but Judge MANSFIELD goes on forever.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LINK].

Mr. LINK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my sincere wishes for many more happy birthdays for our chairman, Judge MANSFIELD.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I have but one more request, but it is so unusual it should be granted; that is, from the gentleman from West Virginia, in whose district Judge MANSFIELD was born [Mr. ELLIS].

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, it is with considerable pride that I bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that Judge MANSFIELD was born in the district I now have the honor of representing. He was born in the county adjoining my home county. While he left the State about the time I was born, yet we have many mutual acquaintances; he knows many of the families I have the pleasure of knowing. And now when I go back to the State, especially to Wayne County, the place of his birth, great numbers of people inquire as to the welfare of Judge MANSFIELD.

Mr. Chairman, I join today with his thousands of friends in congratulations on his eighty-fifth birthday, and wish him many happy years to follow.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, there is a poem that goes something like this: If with pleasure you are viewing any work a man is doing, If you like him or you love him, tell him now. Don't withhold your approbation 'til the priest makes his oration, And he lies with snowy lilies on his brow. For no matter how you shout it, he'll not know about it, For he cannot read his tombstone when he's dead.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot recite poetry as well as some of the other Members, but in any event you get the idea.

I come from Cleveland, Ohio. A former chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, whose place I now occupy on that committee, was Theodore E. Burton, a great man and a fine chairman of this committee. I do not know of a man in the United States who was a more worthy successor to my fellow townsman, Theodore E. Burton, than Judge MANSFIELD. When I became a member of this committee 8 years ago I did not know that Judge MANSFIELD knew where the Cuyahoga River was and where Rocky River was, but he knows every stream and every shoal; he knows all about them. I was amazed to learn how completely informed Judge MANSFIELD was about rivers, harbors, and streams everywhere throughout the Nation. He does not have to refer to books, to look at maps; he knows in his mind exactly what we are talking about, even though it is but a little stream.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I may say to the gentleman that I have a niece who has lived in Rocky River for some 10 years.

Mr. BENDER. The Judge says he has a niece who has lived in Rocky River for 10 years, but I am sure he does not have relatives in every county in the United States, because what Judge MANSFIELD knows about Cuyahoga County he knows about every other county in the country. So I am happy to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a great man, a great statesman, and I hope the voters of Texas appreciate the kind of representation they have, and I hope they will continue the Judge here as long as he wants to serve.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I am certainly happy to be here today to join with my other friends in paying tribute to a man whom I believe is one of the great men of this body. I have been a member of his committee, I have served under him, for more than a decade. I have seen him again and again as he presided over the deliberations of that committee and through all of those years I have been repeatedly confirmed in the first impression I ever had of him, namely, that he was a man of such ster-



ling character that everybody knew that when he made a decision that decision was absolutely fair and honorable. In the first place, he has a rare quality of courage. I have seen him when other men might have faltered a little bit in the things they were called upon to do, but I have never seen Judge MANSFIELD falter for a moment when it became a question of what he believed to be his duty to the country and to the State of Texas which he loves so well.

I deem it a rare privilege to have known and served with him.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege to have served more than two decades in this body with the distinguished gentleman from Texas, and it is a particular pleasure and privilege to have the opportunity on this happy occasion to felicitate him on his passing another notable milestone, in his life, and in the service of the House.

He is one whom his State, and this House, and the Nation delight to honor.

The Nation is under obligation to Judge MANSFIELD. Under his wise and far-seeing administration, millions of acres of wasteland have been reclaimed and made to bloom and blossom as the rose, and a vast empire of the richest land upon the globe has been added to our national resources.

We people, especially, who live on the great rivers, in the great valleys subject to torrential overflow and periodical devastation from floods and miasma, and who have seen him solve the most difficult problems and overcome seemingly insurmountable obstacles and bring to fruition the fondest dreams of the most optimistic conservationists, are under particular obligation to him. He has contributed more directly and effectively to the welfare and prosperity of these sections than many captains of industry and commanders of commerce. He has evinced the highest order of statesmanship. His works will live after him.

And the best of his life and the most fruitful years of his service are yet ahead of him.

Come grow old with me,  
The best is yet to be,  
The last for which the first was made.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to speak on this subject may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise for two purposes: One to keep the RECORD straight, the other to extend the felicitations to Judge MANSFIELD from his real native State. It is claimed that the Judge was born in West Virginia when as a matter of fact at the time he was born there was no West Virginia. Judge MANSFIELD was born in 1861. It was not until 1863 that West Virginia was separated from Virginia and admitted to the

Union. Judge MANSFIELD was therefore born in Virginia, the mother of States, and Virginia, proud of her native son, wishes him many happy returns of the day and the return of many more such happy days.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am very thankful to the gentlemen who have so kindly eulogized me on this occasion, and I have been wondering whether I am really dead or alive. It is so seldom that anybody speaks a good word for a Member of Congress until after he is dead. I am just wondering whether or not I have been dreaming. I have been here quite a while, though some Members have been here longer than I. Perhaps no man in the country has been continuously in public office longer than I have been. If I live until next November I will have been continuously in office 58 years, and strange as it may seem, I was a poor man when I started, so you see what I have accomplished along that line.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say one thing about the work of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I have been blessed with fine gentlemen on that committee ever since I have been chairman of it. When I came here 29 years ago I first served on other committees, one of which was the Committee on Flood Control. In a year or two I was assigned to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I have served on it ever since and have now been chairman of it for about 15 years. I have never had occasion to doubt any member of that committee. We have raised that committee from what it was at one time, I am sorry to say, regarded as a pork-barrel concern. We have now reached a point where that is absolutely out of the question in river and harbor legislation.

Mention was made of Mr. Burton a while ago by my good friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]. Mr. Burton was chairman of that committee for 10 years, and he is the gentleman who started Mr. McGann in the service 44 years ago. Mac, as you know, is a Republican, but we have kept him as secretary of the committee under all Democratic administrations. We have no politics in that committee. We have come to the point where we regard the means of transportation of the commerce of this country as not a political issue. It is an American issue, and no politics has ever slipped into that committee since I have been a member of it that I have been able to discover. No sectionalism has crept into it. We adopt the same rules for the North, for the South, for the East, for the West, for Alaska, and for our insular possessions. We have improved the ports of Hawaii, of Midway and of Wake Island, and quite a number in Alaska, all of which have been so important in this present war. We also have done the same thing for Puerto Rico and for the Virgin Islands. No complaint can come from any of these possessions that they have been neglected so far as the work of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors is con-

cerned and I believe so far as any other committee of Congress is concerned.

When I first came here the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], was one of the first gentlemen I met. He and Senator Kenyon and I were appointed on a committee to meet the President of Czechoslovakia when he came here during World War I and escort him to his hotel. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], as you know, was born in Czechoslovakia, and Senator Kenyon was a great friend of Czechoslovakia. I introduced a resolution for the recognition of that country in the peace treaty which followed, and Senator Kenyon introduced a like resolution in the Senate.

Now I want to say just a word or two about the matter that is before us. The river and harbor bill of last February was the first general river and harbor bill we have in a period of 5 years, approximately 6 years from this time. It contained a large number of projects. Quite a number of them were considered very urgent in the war, and they have already been taken care of by appropriation of Congress and the projects have been completed. A number of them were not. In order to assure Congress that we did not want to interfere with the appropriation of money for war purposes we inserted a provision in that bill that appropriations for projects embraced in it would not be eligible until 6 months after the war. The public roads bill had a like provision. As I am informed, that provision has been repealed, and the Senate has passed a resolution repealing it as to rivers and harbors. The Committee on Flood Control, which embraces projects valued at nearly a billion dollars, did not put such a provision in their bill, consequently those projects have been eligible for appropriation all the time.

My good friend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] made a very eloquent speech yesterday in behalf of some projects in his State and in his district. He was wondering why they were not embraced in the appropriation bill we adopted yesterday. I say to him now that the reason they were not included in that bill was on account of this 6-month provision in the bill in which they were adopted. If this provision is repealed then the gentleman from Florida, and all the others who have projects, can fight their way out before the Budget and before the Committee on Appropriations and, if they are successful, can get appropriations for their projects.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What amount of money would be involved in carrying out the projects in this proposal?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. You understand they have all been approved by the Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I understand that.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The total cost during the 6-year period was \$381,-968,000.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Would that complete all that is involved in this particular resolution?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes; but not all of that is involved here. There are quite a number of these which have been taken care of heretofore as war measures.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Do you mean of these projects that are mentioned in the resolution?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes. This makes them eligible for appropriation without waiting for 6 months after the treaty of peace.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The thing I am wondering about is the distressed condition the country is in financially and whether these things could not go over until we get our Budget balanced and put these matters on the basis of balancing our Budget first. This removes the limitation of 6 months after the war. It seems to me that this is a very important matter. The Government is printing money to pay its bill. From that standpoint alone, I wonder if these things could not wait.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. They await the pleasure of the Congress hereafter. This does not appropriate the money. This simply makes them eligible to the Bureau of the Budget and to the Committee on Appropriations for such action as they may want to take.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I just feel that the action is in that direction anyway.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. You understand they have already been adopted and this is the first and only time in our history that we have ever put a provision like this in a river and harbor bill. Here is the way it will work. Unless this resolution is adopted, the amount recommended by the Budget hereafter will be allocated by the Chief of Engineers, not to these projects, but to other projects that have been authorized heretofore which are not subject to that provision, many of which are not as urgent as some projects in this bill. This simply widens the field from which our splendid Committee on Appropriations can make their selection when they appropriate the money.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I congratulate the committee and others on their sincerity, but at the same time I do have in mind the financial condition of our country.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. All this resolution does is to release a wartime restriction.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. That is it exactly.

Mr. DONDERO. It does not cost any money whatsoever.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It does not cost one cent.

Mr. DONDERO. It simply makes these projects eligible at such time as Congress sees fit to appropriate money for their construction.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The gentleman from Michigan is entirely cor-

rect. He is the ranking Republican member of our committee. I will not say he is second in importance—I rather consider him first in importance in our work, because he has always been so helpful.

Mr. DONDERO. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law 14, 79th Cong.), is amended by striking out the following: "That no project herein authorized shall be appropriated for or constructed until 6 months after the termination of the present wars in which the United States is engaged unless the construction of such project has been recommended by an authorized defense agency and approved by the President as being necessary or desirable in the interest of the national defense and security, and the President has notified the Congress to that effect: Provided further,".*

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think what I shall say will be in order, but in order to be sure, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### CAPITAL OF MISSOURI ONE TIME IN TEXAS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who is usually very careful about his statements and so seldom utters a statement that is not correct, I think made a statement about Texas that is not a correct statement. I expect to answer his statement fully at another time, but at this time I particularly want to call the attention of the membership to the fact that one statement is untrue.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] stated:

For Texas alone of all States has two members on the Committee on Appropriations. No other State has more than one, and some States have none at all, but Texas has two, and Texas therefore has twice the representation at a meeting of the committee than any other State.

In order to keep the record straight, the State of Michigan has two members on the Committee on Appropriations; so does the State of Ohio; so does the State of Missouri, the State of Indiana, the State of Pennsylvania, the State of Massachusetts, the State of New York, and the State of Washington.

Now, the manner in which they are selected is fair and equitable and right. There is no question about the way they are selected, being the right and fair method.

May I invite the gentleman's attention to the fact that one coming from Missouri should be the last to attack, even indirectly, the great State of Texas, and particularly the district that I have the honor to represent.

Back in 1861 to 1865, during the War Between the States, the State of Mis-

souri had their own militia. In the Battle of Booneville they lost to the Federals and they retreated to Carthage, Mo., and they lost there; and they wanted to find a good, safe place to remain during the War Between the States. So the government in exile of the great State of Missouri, the Governor, the attorney general, and all the staff of officers sought a place that would be safe, where they would have protection against people in the North who were at that time referred to by a hyphenated name.

They wanted plenty of food and plenty of clothing, and they wanted everything, the finest place in the world they could get, where they would be absolutely safe. That was No. 1. Where did they go? That Missouri State government not only went to the great State of Texas but they went to my district and to one of the finest and best places in the Southwest, Marshall, Tex., and there the State government in exile remained during the War Between the States.

So, I insist, the gentleman from Missouri should be the last one to even indirectly attack the State that I have the honor to live in or the district that I have the honor to represent. For the purposes of the record I want to insert a statement that was printed in a newspaper in Kansas City, Mo., concerning this matter. It has a picture of the governor's mansion in Marshall, Tex. It has a picture of the statehouse of Missouri that is now at Marshall, Tex. Of course, I cannot put the pictures in the Record, but I will place the statement in the Record.

I made the statement in St. Louis at a meeting of the chamber of commerce one time, and it was challenged. They said, "That cannot be true. It might be Marshall, Mo., but not Marshall, Tex." So an investigation was made, and this newspaper story recounts the facts and they corroborate every word I say.

So I insist the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] should not be attacking Texas. I am certainly not going to attack Missouri. If I were to talk 1 hour about Missouri, every word I would say would be a compliment either to the great State or the people who live in that State or who represent that State.

The newspaper article referred to is as follows:

RELICS OF FUGITIVE MISSOURI CAPITOL OF CIVIL WAR DAYS SURVIVE IN TEXAS—WHEN STATE VOTED LOYALTY TO UNION IN 1861, ITS EXECUTIVE, CLAIBORNE F. JACKSON, WENT TO MARSHALL IN LONE STAR STATE, TAKING OFFICIAL SEAL AND ESTABLISHING GOVERNMENT IN EXILE IN BUILDINGS STILL STANDING  
(By Allene Reeves)

Missourians in true "show me" fashion refused to believe, and demanded proof of Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, when he said a few years ago that a Texas town had once served as the capital of their State for 4 years.

It all happened in the Civil War when Missouri's Gov. Claiborne F. Jackson and Lt. Gov. Thomas C. Reynolds remained loyal to the South. In 1861 when Missouri voted to remain in the Union, and when Federal troops threatened to attack the capital in Jefferson City, Jackson, Reynolds, and their staff fled, seeking a safe place in which to establish a temporary seat of government.

The place they finally chose was Marshall, a small town in a broad and beautiful section



of east Texas. At that time an inland town of only 2,000 inhabitants, Marshall was narrowly separated from the Arkansas and Louisiana State lines; located 18 miles south of Jefferson, Tex., the head of navigation, and 40 miles west of Shreveport, La., the seat of military authority for the trans-Mississippi region. The homes which were occupied by the Missouri government as executive offices and by Jackson as the Governor's mansion are still standing, tenanted, and in good repair.

#### AGAINST SECESSION, 80-1

Elected on the Douglas Democratic ticket in 1860, Jackson and Reynolds were inaugurated on the following January 3. In March of that year, after a winter filled with disturbances and minor clashes between political groups, a constitutional convention was called. This convention was supposed to "carry the State out of the Union," but it surprised its promoters by refusing to do so. Francis Preston Blair, Jr., a strong anti-slavery leader, was largely responsible for the swaying of the convention which decided 80 to 1 not to secede.

Governor Jackson, favoring the proslavery faction, opposed the decision and instead of raising troops as ordered by Lincoln, he called for 50,000 volunteers of his own to resist Federal forces. He was commander in chief of the volunteers, appointing Col. John S. Marmaduke in full command of the troops.

Missouri remained in the Union, but the people were about equally divided in sentiment so it was inevitable that the factions should clash. Early in 1861, the Federalists, under Gen. Nathaniel Lyon defeated proslavery troops under Sterling Price, a former governor.

Defeated in his first military engagement and with Federal troops almost ready to enter Jefferson City, Governor Jackson and his troops went to Boonville in June 1861. Following the battle, Jackson, Reynolds, the secretary of state who carried the great seal, and various departmental heads went farther south.

#### FROM CARTHAGE TO MARSHALL

They stopped at Carthage, where Governor Jackson intended to set up his government, but another battle ensued with northern troops. Although the Confederates sustained only minor casualties in killed and wounded, and were successful in driving the Unionists from Carthage, Jackson decided it would be best if he went still farther from the fighting zones. Leaving Colonel Marmaduke in command, the governor and his associates continued their trek across the country.

Arriving in Marshall, Tex., they decided they had found an ideal location for the Missouri capital in exile. Governor Jackson rented the home of Judge Asa Willie, on the corner of South Bolivar and Crockett Streets, for executive offices. Judge Willie, a member of the supreme court of Texas, had moved his family to Austin. This building now is occupied by two families.

On Crockett Street, directly across Bolivar from the temporary capitol, was the home of Mrs. Mary Key, which Jackson rented for his living quarters. A typical southern home, it provided ample room for the extensive entertaining done in those turbulent days. Various wings have been added to the house which make it appear quite different from the governor's mansion of Civil War days. It is owned by Mrs. Dudley Crawford, of Austin, Tex., whose husband was a direct descendant of Mrs. Mary Key.

Very little is known about the original capitol building which is now owned by Mr. and Mrs. Lew Bates, of Marshall, but it supposedly was only two or three rooms to which a number of rooms have been added. The capitol has been changed less than the mansion, and is now surrounded by many trees.

#### JACKSON HAD THE LEAD

When Governor Jackson left Missouri, Hamilton R. Gamble was elected to replace him, but Jackson based his authority on the fact that he had been duly elected and installed as Missouri's chief executive. All of his orders, decrees and various documents issued from Missouri's Texas capital bore the great seal of State which made them recognized legally by his fellow fugitives, including many Missourians he found in Marshall.

Soon after he established his government in Marshall, Governor Jackson left affairs in the hands of Lieutenant Governor Reynolds, and returned to New Madrid, Mo., where he issued a call for the meeting of the General Assembly at Neosho, Mo., on October 21, 1861. A part of that body met at the designated time and place and declared that Missouri had withdrawn from the Union.

Jackson did not again return to Marshall after the meeting at Neosho, but rejoined Missouri's secession forces in southern Arkansas. He remained with them until his death December 6, 1862, in an improvised hospital near Little Rock, Ark. Lieutenant Governor Reynolds assumed the title of Governor which he retained until Lee's surrender in 1865.

Marshall not only served as capital of Missouri, but when Vicksburg, Miss., and Port Hudson, Miss., fell in 1863, it was chosen as headquarters of the trans-Mississippi area, communication with Richmond, Va., having been suspended.

The only fortified city outside of Galveston at that time, such departments of government as the post office and treasury were set up in Marshall. The Army established its ordnance, hat, shoe, saddle, harness, and cartridge departments there.

#### LUCY HOLCOMBE

The Post Office Department was located in the home of Lucy Holcombe, famous Texas belle who married Francis Wilkinson Pickens, Governor of South Carolina. A regiment of South Carolina troops was named the Holcombe legion in her honor, and she was the only Texas woman to have her picture engraved on Confederate currency.

One and a half miles northwest of the town, a powder mill was erected in which ammunition for the trans-Mississippi department was made and stored.

Fortifications, some of which may still be seen, were built on the surrounding hills for the protection of the mill. These would have no doubt been used had not Gen. Dick Taylor disobeyed orders and intercepted General Banks at Mansfield and Pleasant Hill, La.

Gen. Kirby Smith, a Confederate, thought Banks' objective was to gain Shreveport, but Taylor thought differently and events proved that Banks was attempting to capture Marshall. The battles of Mansfield and Pleasant Hill, 75 miles away, were the nearest fought to Marshall, but General Taylor succeeded in driving Banks down the Red River, saving Marshall from invasion.

Frank Dalton, 96-year-old resident of Gladewater, Tex., claims that he was with Quantrill's raiders, a group which acted as escorts to the Jackson party, and who, according to Dalton, helped Governor Jackson move the official seal and many of the official records to Marshall.

With Lee's surrender in 1865, the Missouri government in Marshall ceased to exist. The great seal, however, remained a wanderer until May 26, 1869, when it was returned to Missouri by Thomas C. Reynolds and given to Gov. Joseph W. McClurg, who had been elected in 1868.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have enjoyed, as I have no doubt all Members have enjoyed,

this unusual chapter in Missouri history recounted by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Of course we went to Texas—most appropriately. Why not? We Missourians had more to do than anybody else had to do with the establishment of the State of Texas. When the call came, in the morning of the Nation's history, to make the far trek into the unknown vastness of the great Southwest and establish there a new commonwealth, it was Missourians, like Kit Carson and Davy Crockett, and a thousand other adventurous spirits from imperial Missouri who led the van. Missouri blood stained the crimson field of San Jacinto and martyred Missourians were in the last six to fall in defense of the Alamo.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. And Stephen F. Austin.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes, and Stephen F. Austin. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD], who knows more about Texas history than any man alive, well says, the heroic figure of Missouri's son, Stephen F. Austin, contributed both military prowess and statesmanship to the foundation of the Republic of Texas and her ultimate admission to the Union.

And a decade later, when the issue again wavered in the balance, it was another Missourian, Gen. Alexander W. Doniphan, with his Missouri cavalrymen who turned the tide of battle from certain defeat to incredible victory.

In what has been termed by military authorities as "the most remarkable military campaign in American history," General Doniphan in command of picked volunteers, all of them Missourians by birth or adoption, marched thousands of miles across desert and plain, without a commissary, penetrated the heart of the enemy country without support of any kind, where a single defeat meant annihilation, and there routed an entrenched army five times its size—and added an empire to the growing domain of the United States.

They compelled the enemy to divide his forces and thereby saved the American army under General Taylor from certain defeat and extermination.

When they again reached civilization, on their way back to Missouri, after an expedition equaled only by the march of Xenophon and his immortal 10,000, they had no supplies, no clothing, and no equipment except their rifles—but every rifle was oiled and in perfect working condition.

So, when the days of adversity came, and the hand of oppression was heavy upon us, whither should we turn but to the lintel of our daughter, flesh of our flesh, blood of our blood, and bone of our bone—to the lone star of Texas shining like a beacon of welcome in the dark hour of our need?

How could I attack the State of Texas? I am certain the remark of the genial gentleman from Texas was inadvertent there. On the contrary, I complimented the State of Texas. I felicitated the Texas delegation on writing into the bill the largest appropriation secured by any State, and on representing the only State

in the Union having two majority members on the Committee on Appropriations. It is a distinction reserved to no other State. And I congratulate the State of Texas that it is represented by so able and devoted a son as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the gentleman from Texas, Judge MANSFIELD.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I understood the gentleman to say that Texas had more in this bill than any other State. The gentleman did not mean the bill under consideration, did he?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to be corrected. I had in mind the bill under consideration yesterday and the colloquy referred to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. We have very little involved in the present bill; practically nothing.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is one of the gentleman's notable characteristics. He is the benevolent distributor of benefits to every State in the Union. I count it a privilege to again pay tribute to his service and to again have the opportunity to testify to the regard and esteem in which he is held by the House and the Nation.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it is true, as claimed by Members, that House Joint Resolution 265, before us, does not authorize the expenditure of any funds for public works on rivers and harbors. What it does, however, is, for all practical purposes, tantamount to such authorization. It opens the way for the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate funds for these purposes. To all who know the workings of matters of this sort, it should be clear that the passage of this resolution means that appropriations for the projects mentioned will be forthcoming in due course of time.

Why cannot such Government ventures as are proposed in this measure be deferred until such time as the Federal Budget is brought in balance and the financial house put in order? Where is the money to come from to finance these projects? Will it be raised by further deficit financing? Under present conditions I fear much of it will.

The Nation is now at grips with one of the most destructive forces society has had to contend with, namely, inflation. How many people in this country know that there is now in circulation and in the banking system well over \$100,000,000,000 of Government printing-press money? Few people realize that more than 40 percent of war costs were financed by Government printing-press money.

It is a most erroneous conception to think that rising prices are the same as inflation. All real or serious inflation is

caused by Government printing-press money, not by shortage of goods. Shortage of goods can and does cause price rises which may on occasion be material but never true inflation. Assuming no increase in the total amount of money in use, price rises readjust themselves as soon as production has relieved the shortage of commodities. The pressure of rising prices with which the Nation is now confronted is not inflation itself but merely a symptom of inflation.

It is not shortage of goods that OPA and all the other agencies involved in the control of prices are really struggling against, but the more than \$100,000,000,000 of Government printing-press money. It is the desperate attempt which these agencies are now making to stem the tide of Government printing-press money that has the home-building industry and many other industries almost on dead center, where those industries know not whether to go backward or try to go forward.

It is not a question of whether these are worthy projects; it is a question rather of whether we can afford them under the dire financial condition the Nation is in. I am convinced that we cannot afford to spend one penny on any of these projects at the present time.

It would seem that the experience which many European countries went through during the last 25 or 30 years should be warning enough to the Congress not to leave a stone unturned to prevent anything similar happening to us. Or are we so foolish as to believe that the kind of printing-press money that has been issued by our Government is somehow so different from that which European governments indulged in that we shall escape its evil effects? If we are, there is a rude awakening ahead for us.

I implore the House to stop and seriously consider the condition of our finances and to discontinue the spending of any money that is not absolutely necessary to the preservation of our national safety and the operation of those Federal Government functions which are essential to the maintenance of justice and order and the national integrity. This should always be the rule.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike to have to disagree with the gentleman from Ohio but there are a lot of worthy projects being held up by this provision, and if we adopt this bill it will give us the opportunity to develop some badly needed projects. For instance, on the Columbia River I know of a new cannery that has been built recently, but the harbor development has been held up. The passage of this bill as is, will repeal the 6 months after the war restriction so it will be possible to go ahead with necessary harbor development. Such work might be held up for years if we fail to pass this bill. We do not know just when peace will be declared. Perhaps not until after the Peace Conference.

Mr. Chairman, as far as balancing the Budget is concerned, it has not been long since we lowered taxes considerably and we did not worry very much about bal-

ancing the Budget at that time. I look at these projects as investments.

I think sometimes the United States has to conduct its business in the same manner as a private business and that is to invest money in order to build a healthy economy to carry this heavy burden of debt.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAVAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I agree with the gentleman. I value the gentleman's opinion very highly. I am wondering now about something. I realize that men have to invest money and the Government has to do likewise. Does the gentleman think this \$70,000,000 invested in a site for the UNO is a worth-while investment? Is that an investment or an expenditure?

Mr. SAVAGE. Of course, this bill does not cover that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know that. I was asking for future guidance.

Mr. SAVAGE. That is an investment in a permanent peace, and I am glad that the United States pays only a fair portion of that amount, which will be infinitesimal compared to the cost of another war.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then the gentleman regrets this quarrel over it, does he not?

Mr. SAVAGE. Oh, certainly but the gentleman knows that that is not germane to this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAVAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Possibly the gentleman missed my point. I was not objecting to the Federal Government borrowing money; I was objecting to the Federal Government printing money. The Constitution provides that the Government shall have authority to borrow money but the Constitution does not provide that the Government shall have authority to print money.

Mr. SAVAGE. The gentleman spoke about balancing the Budget and I agree with him that we want to balance the Budget, but sometimes the easiest way to do it is to make wise investments.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PACE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 265) to provide for proceeding with certain river and harbor projects heretofore authorized to be prosecuted after the termination of the war, pursuant to House Resolution 510, he reported the joint resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has passed an iden-



tical joint resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 105. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of that joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That section 2 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1945 (Public Law 14, 79th Cong.), is amended by striking out the following: "That no project herein authorized shall be appropriated for or constructed until 6 months after the termination of the present wars in which the United States is engaged unless the construction of such project has been recommended by an authorized defense agency and approved by the President as being necessary or desirable in the interest of the national defense and security, and the President has notified the Congress to that effect: *Provided further,*."

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings by which House Joint Resolution 265 was passed were vacated, and the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 265) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and insert therein an article that appeared in the *Kansas City Star*, Kansas City, Mo., relative to the capital of Missouri being at Marshall, Tex.

#### VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the independent offices appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1947, which passed the House on January 24, includes an appropriation of \$2,148,387,000 for readjustment benefits, and the bill provides as to such appropriation that it shall be immediately available.

Fearful that such bill might be delayed in its legislative processes, under date of February 2, the President, in a communication to the Speaker—House Document No. 445—recommended that \$500,000,000 of the amount estimated and approved by the House in the independent offices appropriation bill be made available in advance of the passage of the independent offices appropriation bill.

The committee has considered this proposal to advance the time of availability of additional funds for the fiscal year 1946, and its Deficiency Subcommittee, which considers such proposals, has agreed to recommend to the whole Committee on Appropriations that \$500,000,000 of the 1947 appropriation be made immediately available. Subsequently, General Bradley orally has advised the committee that the current appropriation is now overdrawn and that addi-

tional funds should be made available at the earliest possible moment.

Consequently, I am presenting a joint resolution, a copy of which is at the desk, and ask unanimous consent that it be immediately considered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1946 for "The payment of benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by titles II, III, and V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944," to remain available until expended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the chairman what understanding or arrangement has been made so that this \$500,000,000 may be applicable to the \$2,148,000,000 which was carried in the independent offices appropriation bill as it passed the House?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the joint resolution is agreed to, the half billion dollars which it proposes for appropriation will be subtracted from the \$2,148,387,000 carried for the Veterans' Bureau in the independent offices appropriation bill now pending in the Senate. As a matter of fact, the Senate committee has already agreed to recommend the reduction. This half billion dollars thus advanced will be used for the 1946 Budget, and the remainder of the \$2,148,387,000 will remain in the independent offices appropriation bill to be taken up when the bill is reported to the Senate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. With that understanding, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the chairman this question: There is no change in the amount of the appropriation at all?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no change in the amount. The total appropriation for the Veterans' Administration remains at the figure fixed by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] and his committee, as reported to and passed by the House. The proposition here is merely to make this half billion dollars available immediately to take care of the current requirements of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. HENDRICKS. The bill made it available immediately, but the bill has not been passed. Therefore, the Senate left it out of the bill so that it may be used for this purpose?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct. The gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the subcommittee, was in charge of the independent offices appropriation bill and handled the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration so admirably that no change of any kind is required or proposed. The joint resolution is in response to a situation which has developed unexpectedly and which could not have been foreseen at the time the original bill passed the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman will yield, I understand the gentleman from Missouri has talked with General Bradley, and General Bradley has advised him, and through him the members of the committee, of the immediate urgency for action of this kind. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true. This request is made in response to the recommendation of General Bradley.

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied this sum will be required to meet the immediate demands for veterans' compensation. I would not want to go on record as promising the Congress that as a result of this operation the Veterans' Administration will be able to get along in the fiscal year 1947 on less money. Frankly, they may yet need the full amount that was carried in the bill that was reported out and passed in January. The Administration and the Budget have recommended that this amount be taken out of the independence offices bill as it goes to the Senate and appropriate it in this resolution for immediate use. There is nothing for us to do except provide the requirements to pay the veterans what they are entitled to.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand the Veterans' Administration is very anxious to speed up the payment of compensation claims, which were held up for 4 months at one time because the Army was moving the AGO reports and the medical clinical reports from one point to another so that they could not get those records. I understand the Veterans' Administration is very anxious to get the money now so that every claim can be settled promptly.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Every claim has been paid as soon as adjudicated. There has been no delay from lack of funds. This joint resolution is to insure a continuation of that policy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as has been explained, the immediate need for this money was not foreseen at the time of the passage of the independent offices appropriation bill in the House.

General Bradley told me this morning that he is entirely out of money in this fund; that his requisitions amount to something like \$25,000,000 a week; and that unless prompt action is taken there is a likelihood that funds for the purpose may be deficient in the next few days.

For that reason the subcommittee on deficiencies which has jurisdiction has recommended the joint resolution. And in view of the urgency, after consultation with members of the committee en banc and with the approval of the majority leader and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations now asks for immediate action on the resolution without a formal report.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, who knows as much about this subject as anyone in the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, General Bradley and his entire staff in the Veterans' Administration are doing everything they possibly can to take care of the load that is literally growing by leaps and bounds. It is absolutely necessary for them to have this additional fund in order to meet that demand. I am sure there will be no objection to the passage of the legislation.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts such time as he may require.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind whatsoever that this appropriation should be made and should be made now. We can save time by including the necessary funds in this bill rather than waiting for the independent offices appropriation bill.

At the time the independent offices appropriation bill was on the floor of the House carrying the funds for this purpose, I made certain reference to criticism by the Comptroller General of the financial operations of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration.

The House will have in mind that as a part of my remarks, commencing at page 277 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 23, 1946, I inserted two audits by the Comptroller General, the most recent available, one for the Maritime Commission and the other for the War Shipping Administration, both for the fiscal year 1943. The Comptroller General stated that he expects to complete the audit for the fiscal year 1944 by June 30, 1946.

The findings and recommendations embodied in these audits constitute a major indictment of the financial operations of both agencies.

Attention is called to the fact as appears from a letter dated January 28, 1946, received from Captain Macauley, Acting Chairman of the Maritime Commission, that upon issuance of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 23, 1946, it was first brought to the official notice of himself and his two colleagues, that the Comptroller General had addressed to the Commission his letter of November 19, 1945, and his audit report of the Commission's balance sheet and financial operation as of June 30, 1943. In other words, a period of over 2 months had elapsed before notice of the action by the Comptroller General was brought to the attention of the Congress as a whole or to that of either of the present Commissioners.

This most recent indictment by the Comptroller General, taken in connection with his previous criticism in reference to purchase prices, charter hire rates, and Government insurance values

allowed, to which I have repeatedly called attention on the floor of the House, is presumably responsible for the summary removal yesterday of R. Earl Anderson, the Commission's Director of Finance since 1938, and would seem to call for a thorough house cleaning in both agencies.

If the public interest is to be protected, if the people's money is not to be squandered, surely there must be a vast improvement in the financial operations of both agencies.

The situation raises the question if the conference report on the ship sales bill now pending should not be returned to the conferees for further consideration in the light of the picture painted by the Comptroller General since the consideration of the bill by both Houses, and with a view to obtaining the opinion of the members of the present Maritime Commission, who will be charged with responsibility for its administration. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point the letter referred to from the Maritime Commission and an article appearing in today's edition of the New York Journal of Commerce:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,  
Washington, D. C., January 28, 1946.  
Hon. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,  
Committee on Appropriations,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WIGGLESWORTH: Upon the issuance of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 23, 1946, it was brought to the official notice of myself and my two colleagues for the first time that the Comptroller General had addressed to the Commission his letter of November 19, 1945, and his audit report of the Commission's balance sheet as of June 30, 1943.

I am writing so that you will be advised that the Commission has this day taken action in connection therewith. An inquiry is now in progress to determine the status of the Commission's reply to the Comptroller General, and instructions have today been issued to expedite the reply.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD MACAULEY,  
Acting Chairman.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce of February 8, 1946]

MARITIME COMMISSION REORGANIZES ITS FISCAL DIVISION—ANDERSON OUT IN UPSET AFTER CRITICISM BY ACCOUNTING OFFICE

(By Lee P. Hart)

WASHINGTON, February 7.—In an action believed to have had the prior approval of President Truman, the Maritime Commission today terminated the services of R. Earl Anderson, the Commission's Director of Finance since 1938.

Announcing the anticipated shake-up of its Division of Finance, the Commission said it has appointed Joseph M. Quinn as Director of Finance for Operations, and William L. Slattery as Director of Finance for Construction.

The President's concurrence in the ouster of Mr. Anderson was understood to have been conveyed to the Commission through Commissioner Raymond S. McKeough, who was a White House visitor yesterday. During his visit, it is reported that Commissioner McKeough acquainted the President with an alleged lack of a proper auditing system covering the Commission's \$15,000,000,000 wartime shipbuilding program.

The first inkling of the Commission's concern about the construction auditing system was given on January 27 when Mr. Slattery was designated as a special assistant. Mr.

Slattery had served as general auditor of construction since 1943 in the Division of Finance, headed by Mr. Anderson.

#### WIGGLESWORTH CHARGES

A few days before Representative WIGGLESWORTH, Republican, Massachusetts, had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report of the Comptroller General raising questions about the financial operations of the Maritime Commission and its wartime ship operating counterpart, the War Shipping Administration.

Mr. Anderson, who was out of the city at the time the Commission relieved Mr. Slattery of his duties under the Director of Finance and designated him a Special Assistant, is now in Florida.

The proposed reorganization of the five-member agency, necessitated by the resignations of Admirals Land and Vickery, is believed here to bear a close relationship to the Commission's termination of Mr. Anderson's services.

Admiral Land as Chairman of the Commission brought Mr. Anderson to the finance post 8 years ago, and when the latter was under fire because of Representative WIGGLESWORTH's broadside in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD he consulted the admiral, who is now president of the Air Transport Association. A luncheon-conference is said to have been arranged by Admiral Land for Mr. Anderson with Rear Adm. Earl W. Mills, who, the White House has announced, would be appointed Chairman of the Commission.

#### MENTIONED FOR POST

Following his talk with Admiral Mills, Mr. Anderson made plans for a trip to Florida. He notified Acting Chairman Edward Macauley he would be away from the Commission about 2 weeks. He told members of his staff he would return February 14, adding that Admiral Mills planned to assume the Commission chairmanship on February 15 and "everything would be all right."

Commissioner McKeough's visit to the White House yesterday followed persistent reports that Mr. Anderson, who is said to have been recommended to the President by Admiral Land for appointment to the Commission as a Republican, was slated for a Commission vacancy in the event Admiral Mills would have to be appointed as a Democrat. These reports included a plan to shift Commissioner John M. Carmody to another Government post.

The President has yet to send the Mills nomination to the Senate, reportedly because he is awaiting final approval of legislation permitting the admiral to serve in the civilian post. His nomination of Richard Parkhurst, succeeding Admiral Vickery, has been confirmed by the Senate and Commissioner Parkhurst plans to assume his new duties next Monday.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in this connection and to include a letter from the Maritime Commission, as well as a recent newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish in this connection to express my appreciation and the appreciation of the committee of the efficiency with which General Bradley is administering the affairs of the Veterans' Administration and the desire of the committee to cooperate with him in providing promptly and adequately for every veteran need as soon as processed. His request in this instance has the approval of every member of the committee.



Mr. Speaker, if no one else desires to speak on the subject, I move the previous question on the joint resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein certain excerpts from newspaper editorials and correspondence.

#### PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I do so for the purpose of asking the majority leader what the program will be for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Monday next is District day. There is one bill on the District Calendar, H. R. 5061, pertaining to the salaries of policemen and firemen. I understand there is no opposition to that bill.

No legislation is scheduled to be called up on Tuesday.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the Treasury and Post Office appropriations bill will be considered. General debate will be had on Wednesday. After the disposition of that bill on Thursday, or whenever it is disposed of, there is an urgent deficiency appropriations bill that will come out of the Committee on Appropriations covering four other items.

The program for Friday is undetermined.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therewith an address made last night at the annual Lincoln Day dinner in Washington by Gov. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the location of the capital of the United Nations, and to include therewith a brief filed with the United Nations Committee on behalf of the Governors of Nebraska, Wyoming, and South Dakota.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an article from the Christian Science Monitor and in the other to include a resolution adopted by the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech recently delivered by the gentlewoman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### AMENDING THE HATCH ACT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 504 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1118) to amend the Hatch Act. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am immensely pleased and gratified at how nicely and pleasantly we have been getting along today. I hope, in spite of what I have just read in the newspapers about speeches made here at the Lincoln Day dinner, that we shall continue to be friendly and to act in the best interests of our Nation, giving credit where credit is due, as in the case of this grand old man of Texas, Judge MANSFIELD; and I hope we shall not unjustly and unfairly attack those who, rather, should be praised and commended for their courageous expressions of opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I offer a rule which makes in order a bill amending the ill-advised Hatch Act. It provides for 1 hour of general debate, and that the bill then shall be taken up under the 5-minute rule. As one who was originally opposed to the Hatch Act, I am happy that the Committee on the Judiciary, which has proper jurisdiction over amendments to the act, has taken positive action to remove the harsh penalties provided for so-called transgressions under the act, and to extend the discretion given the Civil Service Commission in case of violations. Consequently I favor the rule, and regret only the committee has not recommended repeal of the whole act.

I am informed that this bill originated in an instance in which a civil-service employee merely circulated a petition on behalf of a lifelong friend and neighbor. He was found guilty of violating the act and dismissed from the Federal service, after having served with dis-

tingtion, honor, and efficiency for 30 years.

By passage of the Hatch Act, miscalled the Clean Politics Act, we have precluded any civil-service employee from so much as aiding his friends and relatives in their political careers. We have penalized good citizenship. The language of the law is so vague that the only salvation is to rigorously refrain from any of the political activities of good citizenship except voting, and the penalties are so harsh that when a violation is proved the Civil Service Commission has no recourse except to discharge the violator. This means an economic death sentence. Once dismissed from Government service under such a stigma, the victim has little chance of further employment, though his violation may have been wholly unintentional and unknowing, since it is almost impossible for a layman to determine what is permitted under the law and what is forbidden.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, while we have passed the Hatch Acts to keep the little man from taking his proper part in civic affairs, and passed the Smith-Connally amendment to the Corrupt Practices Act to keep the unions out of politics, we have done not one thing to keep corporations out of primaries, and nothing whatever to restrain the officers and stockholders of corporations, with their great salaries and their vast purchasing power, except for the ineffectual provisions of the Hatch Act limiting the legal gift of one individual to one political organization in 1 year to \$5,000. We are all familiar with how that prohibition has worked. Political committees mushroomed all over the land. Each State now has its own Republican State committee, authorized to accept gifts either directly or through a finance committee. It would be legally possible, under the Hatch Act, for a Pew or a du Pont or a Mellon, greedy for power, to divide a million dollars among 200 State and national Republican committees, if he so desired, without violation of the act. He could do that every year. The Corrupt Practices Act, which forbids banks, corporations, and unions to make contributions to candidates, applies only to general elections, and every Member here knows of instances in which corporations have entered directly and actively into primary election campaigns.

This, of course, is an election year, and I read in the papers how the Republicans at the Lincoln Day celebration went on record as to what they were going to do to the poor Democrats. Personally, I do not know what more they want. They have control of the House, it seems; somehow or other, they get everything they want, they pass any kind of legislation they desire, no matter how bad.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Not now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, come on now, yield; now, please.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman has been so nice lately that I cannot refuse to yield to him.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Who passed that legislation yesterday? Democrats or Republicans?

Mr. SABATH. The Republican majority. The record shows that 149 Democrats and 149 Republicans voted "aye," and 120 Democrats and 33 Republicans voted "no." So I give credit where credit is due; and that is the reason I am crediting the Republican Party, which, of course, was strengthened by the so-called coalition of gentlemen who dislike organized labor or unions, which have done so much for labor and for the Nation these many years past.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield once more, please?

Mr. SABATH. Not now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, just this once more; then I will quit.

Mr. SABATH. Not now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will sit down if you will just yield to me once more.

Mr. SABATH. Very well.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How could the Republicans, in the minority, pass legislation when the Democrats opposed it?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is very well informed and has a statistical mind. He knows that nominally there are 238 Democrats in the House, 191 Republicans, and 2 from minor parties who vote with the Democrats. He knows there are a few, too few, Republican Members who believe in fair play, and will vote with the Democrats on outrageous legislation of this kind which serves and can serve no useful purpose, not even to elect more Republicans like the gentleman. I will wager that the gentleman and his brethren on that side of the aisle have pored over the statistics of this Congress, over the voting records of individual members, over the figures on the constituencies, far into the night. In my mind's eye there is a picture of the great brains of the Republican National Committee studying commercial reports, atlases, census reports, and making digests to be submitted to the leadership of the minority party. I can see how each Member's voting record has been examined, and how all that is known about him is tabulated, and then the heat is put on. They know every slight ever offered, however unintentional, to one of our Democrats in name only, and how to magnify that into a major insult, and how to fan the fires of wrath and resentment until Members who should know better are prevailed upon to come onto this floor and vote for a disgraceful, stupid bill like this.

Yes; the Democrats have a majority, and I am hopeful that after this bad dream of ours has passed away they will see that they have done nobody any good.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Not just now; I am sorry. Yes; a majority of the Members of the House were elected on the Democratic platform and on the Democratic ticket. Unfortunately, certain plausible Republicans, with their eyes on this Democratic majority, have persuaded many of the Democratic Members to try to commit political suicide, and this vote shows how it works.

The propaganda machine comes into play. Every national organization that has any interest in this legislation sends

a barrage of letters, telegrams, telephone calls, and personal lobbyists to call on Members who might be influenced. A similar barrage is poured into the congressional districts by the Big Berthas of the reactionary business organizations, and the psychology of fear and division is used to scare people in the districts into writing a lot of letters. They do not know they are acting against their own interest. Finally, under this onslaught, some Democrats who certainly should know better are persuaded to vote for vicious, unreasonable bills like this one we have just sent to the Senate.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman might point out that the same situation existed as existed yesterday when we passed the Case bill; the overwhelming majority of the Democrats in the House voted against that bill, but practically all the Republicans, with very few exceptions, voted for it. That is the reason it passed this House.

Mr. SABATH. I fully realize that, and I may say to my colleague from Pennsylvania that I have said many times that there are some Republicans who do think for themselves, who do have the best interests of the whole country at heart, and who have progressive ideas. I felt sorry for them during debate on the Case bill. They wanted to do the right thing. They wanted to come back to Congress. But they are so few and so weak, and the pressure of party leadership is so great, they could not withstand the whip and the club and the spur. I know; I am not blind or deaf. I think the whole country is going to rise up against the Republicans who, with an unfortunately large number of those on my side, engineered this vote, and I think in the Eightieth Congress there is going to be a bigger majority of Democrats than we have today. I think, too, that even on the Republican side of the House there will be new faces, for I believe that Republican voters in districts where Democrats cannot be elected—and there are some such places—are going to nominate liberal and progressive Republicans who, when elected, will vote in accordance with the pledges on which they were elected, and will join with other progressives to legislate for the whole country and not for the privileged few.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I am interested in the gentleman's observation about Republicans controlling the House of Representatives. Would the gentleman say that the Republicans control the all-powerful Committee on Rules, over which the gentleman presides?

Mr. SABATH. They have a great deal to say on that committee. The gentleman knows how that committee is constituted, and many times, unfortunately, they have their way on that committee.

Mr. CURTIS. They have not taken control yet.

Mr. SABATH. At times they go along. There are members of that committee who are broad-minded and liberal gentlemen, and they go along with me on legislation that the Nation needs and the

administration recommends and feels should be enacted into law. Unfortunately, they are forced to go against organized labor, and they go out of their way to support any legislation which they think will hurt unions, no matter how unreasonable, unjust, or unjustified it may be.

Mr. STEWART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEWART. Does the distinguished dean think his analogy of the party coalition helps matters any?

Mr. SABATH. My analogy is nowhere as bad nor does it do as much harm as the fact of the vote yesterday. The act speaks for itself. My words speak for me and for those who think like me. You know, I am fond of all my colleagues, even those who campaign like Democrats and then vote like Republicans, when they go along on the right kind of legislation; but, naturally, as a progressive Democrat, and as one who believes in fair play and justice to all, I feel that the Democrats who have joined with the Republicans in their political suicide pact are not helping themselves, or their party, or their country. The benefits we have all gained in the last 14 years were brought about by a Democratic administration with the loyal support of the Democratic majority in Congress. The Republicans have never done anything for the South, the gentleman from Oklahoma may recall. He may remember cotton rotting in the fields under Republican administrations because the market price did not pay for the labor to pick it and haul it to the gins. He may remember the worn-out lands, the poverty-stricken people, the lack of industries to balance the agricultural economy of the South.

Now, I want to see the South prosper. I have never refused to give my support to any legislation that would aid the South or would aid agriculture. It delights me to read about the new factories in Oklahoma and Texas and Mississippi and in all the Southern States. I am very happy, and the gentleman from Oklahoma should be happy, that the South is more prosperous today than ever before. The South has been Democratic ever since there was a Democratic Party, proving the wisdom of the southern people; and I cannot understand how some good and lifelong Democrats can permit themselves to be seduced by the wiles of the clever Republican sirens.

Yesterday the Republicans celebrated at a Lincoln Day dinner. I hope my Democratic colleagues took notice that the main object of all the speakers at the dinner was to throw the Democrats out of office and take formal control of the House of Representatives. They think they are strong enough to do that, deluded by the flood of party contributions coming in because of these Lincoln Day dinners. Lincoln's memory should be honored by all patriotic Americans, and these dinners should be patriotic memorial services for that great friend of the common man, not arranged as celebrations and misused for the purpose of collecting large sums for the coming election campaigns to accomplish what was



uppermost in the minds of all the speakers and all those present. The Republicans are going to try to buy the votes of the American people by pouring out money for propaganda and influence, and if need be even by trying to purchase the votes in some of the districts. Personally, I do not believe the votes of the American public are for sale. The Republicans tried and failed in 1940 and 1944, when they spent more than \$20,000,000, and still could not make a sale. I do not believe that any amount of money spent for political propaganda could fool the American people into voting for a Republican House and going back to the days of Hoover. Since the Republicans sponsored and passed the Case bill I am sure they have not a chance in the coming election.

In connection with the Lincoln Day dinners held in the East, the North, and the West, I cannot refrain from calling attention to what happened in my own city of Chicago. There the Republican leaders were, unfortunately, extremely avaricious, and bent upon securing greater campaign contributions than ever before. They employed threats and coercion, and even misrepresentation in attempting to wring from every potential contributor the last penny. Unfortunately for them, they were so brazen that some of the former contributors to the Republican campaign resented the demand for contributions twice and even five times as great as they formerly had given, and the entire scandal came to light and caused such a furore that the Governor, although a practical politician and a Republican, called off the dinner in Chicago. He feared that the solicitors for the dinner had gone too far astray, and that the resulting bad publicity was so harsh, and the businessmen and manufacturers and State officeholders who had been high-pressured were so resentful, that he had to stop the whole affair to save the Republican Party from disgrace.

I cannot but wonder, Mr. Speaker, how many more such Lincoln Day dinners would have been canceled had all the methods used to force large contributions come to light in other cities, which surely were tantamount to the sand-bagging methods used in Chicago?

Let Members take note that of all the high Republican personages at the Lincoln Day dinner here in Washington not one expressed disapproval of that high-handed effort to extort huge contributions through the excuse of a patriotic celebration.

Not one Republican voice was raised in condemnation of the solicitation in the past of huge sums from rich and powerful families such as the du Ponts, the Pews and others who disgorged the \$20,000,000 in 1940, and even more in 1944, for the benefit of the various Republican campaign funds. These gifts met with the approval of the Republican leaders and of the financial planners of the Republican National Committee, the House Republican campaign committee, and the Senate Republican campaign committee. Yet these same gentlemen will tell us it should be against the law for union members to give a dollar each

for political education, and they have demanded the passage of the Smith-May-Arends bill which would make it a crime for a union worker to contribute \$1.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEWART. What does the distinguished gentleman think of a Cabinet member in the Department of Commerce recommending an American Labor candidate for Congress from New York?

Mr. SABATH. I know the Secretary of Commerce, and I have faith that any candidate he may have endorsed is a man of high reputation and ability. I say that notwithstanding that the Democratic candidate is a personal friend of mine who made a splendid record in the House of Representatives, a record with which the Secretary of Commerce perhaps is not familiar.

The mere fact that a man is friendly to labor is not detrimental. Free of any obligations to special interests, almost invariably the legislator who stands up for the rights of labor, and for whom labor stands up, can vote according to the dictates of his conscience and the public welfare. He does not, as so many of our Republican brethren do, promise one thing in the campaign for election and then do something entirely different in office. We need more Members of Congress who represent the whole Nation, and have the national interests and welfare at heart, and who are not elected and controlled by vested interests. I will go so far as to say that I hope we have more like that, regardless of where they sit in this House.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Let me say that the gentleman had a piece of land in my district at one time, so I feel he is a constituent of mine. The gentleman made a comment awhile ago that interested me. It was this: He said he could not understand why the southern Members of the House voted the way they did, because they had received very lavish appropriations from this administration. My question is this: Does the gentleman believe that by making those appropriations the administration was buying the votes of southern Democrats, against their own convictions?

Mr. SABATH. I say to the gentleman that I did not mention appropriations. I say that the Southern States and all the States have derived tremendous benefits and advantages under the Democratic administration. I think that appreciation should be shown for the Democratic administration that has done so much for the people not only in the South, to which the gentleman has called attention, but in every section of the country.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The gentleman mentioned the Democratic group who voted for the Case bill, and I thought he was referring to southern Democrats, many of whom voted that way.

Mr. SABATH. But I refrained from saying anything against southern Democrats. I said not one unkind word about any southern gentleman or against any Southern State. Nevertheless I will say now that I regret that Members on this side of the House have on occasion seen fit to aid the Republicans, and have voted with the Republicans. I hope they will soon see the error of their ways, and will not continue to cut their noses in spite at their faces.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It happens in this instance that I did vote against the Case bill, as the gentleman also did. I thought the bill would not produce the results claimed for it; in fact, that it will produce more industrial unrest. What I was interested in was this: Does the gentleman believe there is any connection between the appropriations that a Congressman may get and the way he should vote?

Mr. SABATH. No; and there should not be, and I hope there never will be any. But I will say this: California has not suffered in the appropriations we have made. California, like other Western States, and like all the States of the Union, has benefited from a wise and energetic Democratic administration. California has proved its appreciation of administration conduct of the Nation's business by increasing the Democratic membership of its congressional delegation. I believe firmly that in the coming election California will send more Democratic Members to this House, and will return a Democrat to the Senate and to the Governor's chair. I believe with equal firmness that a Democratic administration and a Democratic Congress will continue to serve the Nation. I know, and we all know, that under Democratic administrations the rights and interests of the people have been and are preserved, protected, and safeguarded.

I am pleased to be reminded that the gentleman did vote against the Case bill. Knowing him as I do, I should have known he would not let himself be clubbed into line and forced to vote for that indefensible bill he so accurately described. He was, indeed, one of those 33 Republicans with the courage to follow the dictates of their own conscience and intelligence. I regret there were not more like him on his side. I am confident that the people of his district will approve, as do the people of the Nation, of the gentleman's vote against this monstrosity, indeed, as the people of the Nation applaud all who voted against it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to my smiling, splendid colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we have all been entertained. I am sure we appreciate that habit is sometimes a bad thing. The habit of talking out of order is a worse thing. We have been talking labor for 5 days. We have gotten the habit. The bill is now in the Senate, a post mortem will not help any. When some people get in a habit, the habit gets the best of their better judgment and they just do not think what effect it is having on the people who are compelled to undergo certain things because of the habit. I hope that in the future my distinguished chairman will

think and talk in prospect rather than retrospect. Retrospect is a fine thing when we sit down and soliloquize and talk about the past and what has happened in other days, but it does not have much to do with where we are going, only as we profit by experience.

I am not going to take any more time. All this talk has nothing to do with what is before the House. There is a rule before the House to make in order a certain bill reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary. There will be 1 hour of general debate under that rule, if the House sees fit to take that time. Then the bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for the tribute he paid Governor Green for doing the right thing when he canceled the banquet for which funds were improperly solicited. I also want to join with my distinguished leader in hoping that the advice he is giving the young man from Illinois, the chairman of the Rules Committee, will be appreciated.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, when General Eisenhower issued a statement regarding the release of men and officers from the Army, there was a certain group that I feel were prejudiced by the particular plan he laid down. On the whole the plan was specific, definite, and just, but there are a few instances in which I think it is very unjust and unfair. In order to present the picture to you specifically, I shall read a letter from a young lawyer, a very good friend of mine, and a constituent, which points out the injustice to a group of men who are now in the Pacific. The letter is as follows:

JANUARY 17, 1945.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I have written to you, Mr. JOHNSON, as an old friend and a member of the House Military Affairs Committee to point out that behind the verbiage of the War Department order of January 15 in respect to demobilization is hidden the virtual abandonment of the point system. This system was adopted after polling of GI's and competent consultation at home and its balancing of length of service, dependency, overseas service, and combat experience met with general agreement among the troops.

That the new system signalizes the abandonment of the point system is painfully illustrated by my own plight. As of September 2, 1945, I had 1 year of overseas service, 4 campaign stars, and 64 points. As of January 1, 1946, I had 3 years of service. Under the former system of gradual diminution of the critical point score, I anticipated discharge in March. But under the War Department program of January 15, the diminution in the critical point score has virtually ceased (for officers it will drop from 68 to 67 between January 15 and April 30 and 67 to 65 between April 30 and June 30). Some time in June I will be discharged as an officer with 3 years and 6 months of service. But if I had spent the entire time in the States I would also be released in June. Those four bitter, miserable, dangerous campaigns in the southwest Pacific won't get me out 1 minute sooner.

The many thousands of Pacific veterans once more feel that those far from home are forgotten. When the House and Senate were informed on January 14 by the War Department that "release of all personnel will follow the principle of priority release for those with highest points and longest length of service, particularly combat," they were given a bald misstatement of fact.

This young man is a man who is a graduate of a university and law school. He was a highly successful young lawyer. I think men of that kind who have served in bitter campaigns far away from home, where they fight the elements as hard as they fight the enemy, ought to be given a better break than this man and thousands of others are going to get. I know there are many thousands of young officers in the American Army at domestic posts who are not occupied except for a very small portion of their time. Some of those men should go over and take the place of these young officers who have had these very bitter and very hard experiences. I do hope that the War Department will find some way to ameliorate this condition and change their rule so as to let some of these men come home to resume their occupations where they left off when they went into the Army.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1118), to amend the Hatch Act.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1118, with Mr. PACE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, as I said the other day in discussing this bill, there is only one point in it and that is whether or not the Civil Service Commission, in administering this act, shall have some discretion as to whether they will inflict the supreme penalty of firing a civil servant, as the one in Philadelphia was, who had served 30 years in the postal service, and who, to accommodate a former colleague in the service, circulated a petition to put his name on the list of candidates for justice of the peace or some other minor office of that kind, without realizing, of course, that he was violating any law. Now, the Civil Service Commission says they think it would be outrageous, but they have no discretion except to fire the man and to deny him any part of the retirement fund to which he has contributed for 30 years. The Civil Service Commission that is administering the act, and the Budget, and all other agencies agree in requesting the passage of this bill. I understand there is an amendment to which, so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly agreeable. In addition, the committee has a couple of amendments. So I do not see any use

in taking up any further time. I have no requests for time on our side, Mr. Chairman, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I yield.

Mr. SASSCER. I just by chance heard the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Alabama. I wish to commend him for this amendment, which is certainly in the right direction. I hope the day will soon come when the Hatch Act will be repealed, and American citizens can freely express themselves, both in primary and in general elections.

Mr. HOBBS. I neglected to say the distinguished author of the act is in favor of this amendment.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. It seems to me this is certainly a step in the right direction. All of us who have had occasion to observe the actual application of the Hatch Act in its present form have felt that in many instances the punishment was entirely too drastic. I am thinking, for example, of a case that came up in the State of Louisiana, in which a Federal employee serving as judge or clerk in a school election was forced to resign from his position in one of the Government departments because, not knowing this was a violation of the Hatch Act, he had taken 1 day off in which to help his school district in conducting a school election.

The gentleman will agree, I am sure, that is a good illustration of the law in its present form, and that we should correct such situations as I have described.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I was pleased and gratified that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] admitted a while ago that there are some splendid Republicans. I join with him in the hope that there will be more in the next Congress, but I cannot agree with him that the Hatch Act should be repealed.

It is a necessary law. It is designed to eliminate some serious abuses in our elective system, and it has had that effect. I doubt if any of the gentlemen advocating its repeal favor the use of the official power and authority of a man in high position—an executive—to browbeat or intimidate those about him for political purposes. That is wrong. We all know it is wrong. I doubt if anybody will justify an officer of the Government offering employment as a consideration for political assistance. I doubt if anyone will justify the threat or attempt to deprive a man of his position in the Government to compel political support as the price of holding his job. I will not go through all the provisions, but I will say the Hatch Act is necessary. It has accomplished a great deal of good and should remain on the books. Although it is not a perfect law, it is designed to protect the free right of suffrage of Gov-



ernment employees, and has that result in many instances.

Incidentally, may I say this act was passed in the Seventy-sixth Congress. It was sponsored by a distinguished Democratic Senator from the State of New Mexico. At that time the Republicans in the House were at their lowest ebb, so far as numbers are concerned. As I remember, there were about 90 Republicans in this body when the Hatch Act was passed overwhelmingly. So let us not get any politics into this discussion, or describe it as a Republican measure, although we supported it almost unanimously.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield.

Mr. SASSCER. Does the gentleman feel that a person holding office in the Federal Government, the Treasury Department, the Government Printing Office, or wherever he may be employed, should be precluded on primary day or on election day or a few days prior to those dates from expressing his opinion as to who is the best candidate for sheriff or for county commissioner, or Congressman or what not?

Mr. HANCOCK. There is a provision in the act answering the gentleman's question which reads as follows:

All such persons, as people in the executive branch of the Government, shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express their opinions on any political subject.

I am not here to claim that the Hatch Acts, either the one passed in August 1939 or the second Hatch Act, passed a year later, are perfect. There are many inconsistencies between the two acts. One affects Federal employees and the other State employees whose compensation is paid in whole or in part with Federal appropriations. Their rights and the prescribed procedure differ in the two laws and they should be made to harmonize. Those inconsistencies should be ironed out, but we cannot do it here today in the Committee of the Whole in the consideration of the bill before us.

Let us understand exactly what is attempted to be accomplished by this bill. It is the opinion of the Judiciary Committee, and we are unanimous, that the punishment provided for the violation of any of these provisions in the first Hatch Act, that is, the one of August 1939, is altogether too severe. There is only one penalty imposed by that act, and I quote it:

Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be immediately removed from the position or office held by him, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by any act of Congress for such position or office shall be used to pay the compensation of such person.

No other penalty is provided. That is an exclusive and in many cases an excessive penalty. It means the loss of a man's livelihood even though he may have held a civil service position and accumulated rights for 30 or more years. There are some violations by people in executive positions which perhaps should be met with dismissal from the service, but there are many trivial ones such as the one cited by the gentleman from

Alabama. For example, if the superintendent of mails in the city post office requires his letter carriers to distribute political literature, to wear a political button, to sign some particular candidate's petition, and to promise to exert his influence in behalf of his superior's candidate, that is such a misuse of power as does warrant dismissal. Dismissal is not too severe a penalty for that sort of thing. On the other hand, however, if a letter carrier after hours, on his own time, goes to his own personal friends in his own neighborhood and says: "Now, my friend, John Jones, is a candidate for alderman. Will you please sign his nominating petition?" That to my mind is a trivial offense, and certainly we are not justified in saying that such an individual shall lose his position in the Federal Government for life. We are all agreed on that.

All this bill does is to give the Civil Service Commission the right to impose some penalty less than the extreme and mandatory penalty prescribed by the law, which in its discretion will be adequate for the offense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Now, to get down to the first committee amendment. I am sure there will not be any opposition at all to the bill itself, because it is right. The bill as introduced by the gentleman from Georgia provides:

If the Commission—

That is, the Civil Service Commission—finds the violation does not warrant removal, a lesser penalty shall be imposed by direction of the Commission.

That is the way the bill reads as introduced. As I understand, that is the language that was approved by the Civil Service Commission.

The committee proposes to offer an amendment making this language read as follows:

If the Commission finds that violation does not warrant removal, a lesser penalty not to exceed a fine of 3 months' compensation may be imposed by direction of the Commission.

It seems to me that divides the offenses against the Hatch Act into two categories: One, those which are appropriately punished with dismissal from the service; and, two, those which could be punished under the language of this proposed amendment only with what is the comparatively light sentence of 3 months' fine, or less.

It occurs to me there is a great twilight zone of offenses which are neither so trivial that a 3 months' fine would be adequate or appropriate, or so severe that the punishment should be permanent dismissal from holding public office. I am therefore opposed to the committee amendment. I can visualize offenses where punishment of a fine of more than 3 months' pay, or suspension for an indefinite period, or reduction in rank in the office the man holds, or transfer to another job, or a mere reprimand and warning, might be adequate and more fitting than a fine of 3 months' compensation, or any fine at all.

It seems to me the present law is too inflexible in one direction and that perhaps the committee amendment is too inflexible in the other. So when the committee amendment is offered I am going to move to reject the committee amendment.

I hope I have made myself sufficiently clear that you will support me in my position.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield.

Mr. SASSCER. The gentleman from New York stated, and I believe correctly, that under the Hatch Act a man can express his opinion as to a candidate—

Mr. HANCOCK. And issues.

Mr. SASSCER. And issues. It is also quite apparent under the Hatch Act that he cannot electioneer after hours; as in the case of the mail carrier the gentleman just cited, he cannot solicit votes for a candidate of his choice.

Would the gentleman be kind enough to clarify that twilight zone and explain the difference between expressing your opinion and electioneering; that is, when you cease to express an opinion and when you get into the realm of electioneering?

Mr. HANCOCK. That is a very interesting and difficult question. The Civil Service Commission is the body to determine it. You cannot accurately define the difference by law. But, as I said a moment ago, I think the two Hatch Acts are inconsistent and imperfect. There are many things that ought to be corrected and improved, but we cannot do that today. All we are attempting to do today is to take out of the law that inflexible proposition that a man found guilty of violating any provision of the Hatch Act must be dismissed from the service permanently. That, in my opinion, is excessive punishment and I am opposed to it. I hope you will agree with me in rejecting the committee amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do I understand that as the gentleman wants the bill amended it will prohibit the assessment of any penalty greater than 3 months' compensation?

Mr. HANCOCK. No; the way I want it read is the way it was approved by the Civil Service Commission and as introduced by the gentleman from Georgia, so that it would read that if the Commission finds that the violation does not warrant removal, a lesser penalty shall be imposed by direction of the Commission. The committee amendment would make the maximum punishment short of dismissal a 3 months' fine. That might not be adequate in many cases, and it might not be the appropriate form of punishment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time and now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, we carefully considered this bill in the Judiciary Committee and may I say that I am

in accord with the view expressed by my colleague from New York [Mr. HANCOCK]. I am wholeheartedly in favor of the bill in the exact language in which it was introduced by the gentleman from Georgia. I make that statement for the reason that the bill in that form provides a flexible provision which is given to the Commission to determine what should be done in each particular case based upon the facts in that case. As the bill was introduced it contains the provision that if the Commission finds the violation does not warrant removal a lesser penalty shall be imposed at the direction of the Commission. In other words, under that language the Commission will have the power and the authority to impose a fine of 1 day's or 2 day's pay, or a week's pay, whatever the facts might justify, or they could suspend a man for a day, for a week, for a month, or for 6 months if the facts justified such action. There is not any limitation in that language. It places the entire matter with the Commission, and the Commission is the body that has the power, and should have the control, over all matters coming within the purview of its authority in such cases.

I will read the amendment proposed:

If the Commission finds that the violation does not warrant removal, a lesser penalty not to exceed a fine of 3 months' compensation may be imposed by direction of the Commission.

It might be that the Commission would not want to impose a fine of 3 months' compensation or some lesser fine. It might be that under the facts of a given case the Commission might want to suspend a man for a month or for 2 months or for 3 months; but that could not be done under the provisions of this committee amendment.

After we have analyzed this entire situation it is my considered judgment that the bill in the original form in which it was introduced by the gentleman from Georgia is far more preferable, because it leaves the matter entirely in the discretion of the Commission.

With respect to the remainder of the amendment, I have no objection to that provision. That provision reads:

The Commission is authorized and directed to reopen and reconsider all cases heretofore determined under this act in which a penalty of removal from office or position has been imposed and in lieu of such penalty of removal to impose a penalty within the limits hereinbefore authorized in this section if in the judgment of the Commission the violation would not have warranted removal if this amendment had been in force and effect at the time of such violation.

My distinguished colleague and friend from Alabama has mentioned some of the cases which were specifically brought before our committee. There were one or two cases in which there had been some slight infraction of the Hatch Act, but not intentional on the part of the person who had violated the provisions of that law. But under the law as it then was written, and under the law as it then existed, the Commission could do but one thing, and that was to remove the person from office; but under the provisions of this law, as it is proposed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON], with that

provision which I have just mentioned, reading:

If the Commission finds that the violation does not warrant removal, a lesser penalty shall be imposed by direction of the Commission.

That means that the Commission could impose a penalty of a fine of so many days' pay, or they could suspend a person for so many days. It is all left to the discretion and in the hands of the Commission to determine under the particular facts of the case; under the latter provision which I have mentioned just a few moments ago, that gives the Commission the right and the power to return and reconsider those cases where discharges and dismissals have been absolutely imposed under the law as it existed, and those cases reviewed, and a lesser penalty could be imposed, all within the purview of the discretion and decision of the Commission.

It is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that the bill will be passed in its original form introduced, and with the amendment at the end of the bill, as I have suggested, approved and concurred in by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER], has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I have the honor to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON], the author of the bill, 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that anything that I may say on this bill will be of any benefit, because I do not think there is a great deal of opposition to the measure. Any statement that I may make in regard to the Hatch Act being repealed I am sure would have no place in this debate, for the reason that the Hatch Act as a whole is not on trial today. I will state, though, that it is my personal view that the Hatch Act should be repealed in its entirety. Since I have been in Washington I have heard so much about certain laws being made for the common man. If there was ever a law that was made for the common man it was the Hatch Act, because he is the only man it is permitted to function against. The boys in the higher brackets can go out and contribute up to the extent of \$50,000 and make speeches throughout the land, and nothing is said, but the little fellow who totes a mail bag or performs some other small job is pinched. So it is clearly a law made for the common man.

What we seek to do in this instance is to give the Civil Service Commission, in common parlance, some discretion in measuring the punishment to fit the violation, whatever it may be or to whatever extent it may go. The Hatch Act as originally written and as it operates today would be similar to a State legislature writing a bill saying, "It shall be unlawful in the State of so-and-so to commit murder, to steal hogs, to whip your wife, or to drive your automobile over 50 miles an hour. Anyone who violates any of these laws shall be punished by death by electrocution," because the Hatch Act sets out that if anyone violates the act in any degree the punishment shall be expulsion from the service. All this amendment seeks to do is to give

the Civil Service Commission some leverage, some discretion, in measuring the punishment by the degree of the crime.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is it not the thought of the distinguished gentleman that the entire question of what penalty should be imposed should be left with the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. GIBSON. Frankly, I think so, but the committee handling the bill thought otherwise. I am perfectly willing to accede to the committee's views, but that is my personal view.

Mr. SPRINGER. Does not the gentleman believe that in many instances the provision for a fine of 3 months' compensation might not be proper, because the fine might not be justified whereas suspension might be justified?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes; I am inclined to agree with the gentleman. If the gentleman will read closely the amendment proposed by the committee, he will find that it says not to exceed 3 months' compensation. It could be a day's compensation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Under that provision there could be no suspension imposed?

Mr. GIBSON. No; I think the gentleman is correct about that.

Mr. SPRINGER. It would be far better to leave the matter entirely to the discretion of the Civil Service Commission, would it not?

Mr. GIBSON. That is my personal view, because in very minor cases they could punish by a reprimand, under the original amendment.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. I have drawn an amendment which would leave the bill as it is and leave the committee amendment as it is, but strike out the words "not to exceed a fine of 3 months' compensation." That would leave it in the discretion of the Commission to apply anything from a reprimand up to and including dismissal from the service. If we try to limit it to 3 months or 6 months, then there is a long breach in between 6 months and dismissal. So I am inclined to think that to leave it in the discretion of the Commission would be a better proposition, and not harness them with the restriction that they will either have to kick a man out or give him something that is very mild in the way of punishment.

Mr. GIBSON. That is clearly my personal view, but I am willing to accede to the committee's wishes or to that amendment, either one.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute for the purpose of calling attention of the House to what might be called the third "hatch" act. Selma, Ala., my home town, occasionally has a spell of cold weather. In one of those, a taxi driver had just discharged a passenger in the downtown section, and a little later discovered an egg rolling around on the back seat. Not wishing



to run the risk of his next fare's mashing the egg and soiling his suit, and in the hope that he might return the egg to its owner, he put the egg into one of his furlined gloves and into the cowl compartment. The taxi ran 24 hours a day and kept warm, and in due season the inevitable happened and we had the third "hatch" act. The chicken lived, and was exhibited in one of the show windows of one of our department stores.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 9 (b) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 9. (b) If in the case of any person violating the provisions of this section it is found by the United States Civil Service Commission that such violation warrants removal he shall be immediately removed from the position or office held by him, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by any act of Congress for such position or office shall be used to pay the compensation of such person. If the Commission finds that the violation does not warrant removal, a lesser penalty shall be imposed by direction of the Commission."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "Sec. 9."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 4, strike out the word "shall" and insert "not to exceed a fine of 3 months' compensation may."

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARDEN: On page 2, line 4, strike out the words "not to exceed a fine of 3 months' compensation."

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment makes the bill read as follows:

If the Commission finds that the violation does not warrant removal, a lesser penalty may be imposed by direction of the Commission.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, we are in absolute accord with such a change in the committee amendment.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will concede that his amendment substituting the word "may" for "shall" is an improvement on the language of the bill as introduced.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 6, after the period insert "the Commission is authorized and directed to reopen and reconsider all cases heretofore determined under this act in which a penalty of removal from office or position has been imposed and in lieu of such penalty of removal to impose a penalty within the limits hereinbefore authorized in this section if in the judgment of the Commission the violation would not have warranted removal if this amendment had been in force and effect at the time of such violation."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. MILLS having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. PACE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1118) pursuant to House Resolution 504, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. MILLS]. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### H. R. 5117—MINORITY REPORT

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a minority report on the bill H. R. 5117.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I find but one fault with H. R. 1118. It does not go far enough. I think the Hatch Act should be repealed. In my opinion, there is not to be found in force today a more undemocratic piece of legislation. Free and open discussion of political matters has, under the American system, been one of our most jealously guarded rights.

To say that men and women cannot, because their daily bread comes from the Federal Government, enjoy freedom of speech is going a long way. Yet, that is what we do under the Hatch Act as it stands today.

H. R. 1118 as it is now written places in the discretion of the Civil Service Commission the right to impose lighter penalties for violations of the Hatch Act, or to impose no penalty at all if the so-called offense is trivial. Consequently, I support the measure.

Its passage is a tribute to the work of its author, the able and distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON], and to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, that great and good Alabamian [Mr. HOBBS]. They are

to be commended for bringing the measure before the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### HOUSING

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak again to the membership of the House of Representatives on the Nation's No. 1 problem—housing.

When the House reconvened back in October 1945 after a very brief late summer recess I took the floor to discuss this subject, because everywhere I went through my congressional district it was the one which evoked the most thought, and the most concern.

I said then that the war-weary young man who spent from 2 to 4 years fighting the battle of freedom in the remote parts of the world had returned to his home community in the hope of reestablishing his home, or perhaps, as in the majority of cases, with the thought of having his own home for the first time in his life.

But he found no homes and little material with which to build one if he has the money to do so.

America today is housing conscious. And well it should be. We face an immediate shortage of 3,000,000 homes. We must start today to solve the problem of housing, or at the present rate, this national shortage will grow to 8,000,000 in 10 years. That is how serious this problem is.

The housing shortage did not begin with the war. It was merely aggravated by it. It has been a major problem for 15 years. It started in the late twenties. During the depression years there was no construction except for the higher-income groups.

The national administration with the beginning of Franklin D. Roosevelt's first term had the foresight to see the seriousness of the housing shortage and there were steps taken for the first time on a public housing program—and a gradual increase in earning power of the low-income groups brought a brief era of private home building. Several Federal agencies gave encouragement to persons desiring to build and own their own homes and many new residential areas sprung up in every community in the country.

But the war stopped that home-building boom. When it came we were nowhere close to having taken up the slack a long period of no building at all had brought upon us. With the war all materials were needed for war building and little went into home building, except of a temporary nature.

All through the war, even with defense housing projects, every community faced a housing problem. Returning war veterans today only exaggerated the crying need for more and more homes—made Americans finally conscious of the housing shortage.

I believe it is Congress' responsibility to immediately take steps to solve this No. 1 problem. Action should be taken promptly upon the best of the housing legislation already proposed. The committees before which this problem has been laid are, I know, doing their best to

bring out the best possible measures but we cannot stress too much the need for action without further delay.

Congress must seek to eliminate all obstacles that are holding up building by private enterprise. The fact is there is no real construction in progress now and we dare not delay any longer in getting building under way.

During the war our Government quickly built war plants to save our Nation, and it is equally important in the fight for the preservation of our country that the Government take steps to provide decent homes in which American families can be raised.

We met all emergencies in time of war. Why cannot we meet this housing emergency with the same determination? If we were at war today and we needed houses we would build our way out of it.

Time is of the essence now, and we must bypass all obstacles. We should lend to industry the great war powers of Government as an investment in the security of our Nation and for the welfare of our returning veterans. It is the solemn obligation of our Government to relieve this acute housing situation.

President Truman, 4 months ago, in his 21-point program for the Nation, emphasized the need for broad and comprehensive housing legislation at an early date. One measure introduced which seems to carry out the President's proposal in the field of housing is the Wagner-Ellender-Taft proposal now under consideration before a Senate committee.

It proposes the complete postwar program for which people throughout the country have waited long. The bill recognizes that decent housing is an American right and an indispensable requirement for good citizenship. It further recognizes that there are different income groups in the United States, with different housing problems.

It contemplates that unaided private enterprise will serve as many of these people as it can with decent housing within their means. It contends that the Government has already been successful, through various plans, in helping private enterprise to serve more people with better housing at lower costs.

The bill provides a new type of insurance to help private enterprise more, and it also provides a method of clearing slums and preparing urban land for redevelopment. By it the low-rent public housing program would be extended and improved. Special emphasis is placed on the problems of veterans and their families. A single National Housing Agency, set up under the bill, would give uniformity to whatever the Government may do in the housing field.

It is time for the Government to use all the power at its command to take control of the housing situation through the enactment of legislation that will comply with President Truman's request. There should be no room left for failure in this matter. It must be tackled as a problem equally important as winning the decisive battle of the war.

John B. Blandford, Jr., National Housing Administrator, recently stressed the

appalling need for new homes before a Senate committee.

By the end of next year—

Blandford said—

the number of families forced to double up in whatever accommodations they can find will reach 6,480,000, or more than the combined number of families in our three largest cities.

He estimated that it will take 12,600,000 new homes, about 66 percent of them at charges not to exceed \$40 a month, to meet the demands during the next 10 years. He pointed out that 20 percent of existing housing is more than 40 years old and about 40 percent was built more than 30 years ago. Thirty-nine percent is in a rundown condition and 25 percent lacks even running water and plumbing.

Most of these dwellings are in slum areas, the largest percentage of which, incidentally, are in cities of less than 500,000 population. In his testimony before the committee Administrator Blandford, hitting at opponents of proposed public housing, remarked: "They would rather sink the whole ship than look at the whole need."

Buyers of whatever homes are to be built must also look to the Government for protection from inflationary prices. President Truman has asked Congress for price control on all residential property and legislation is under consideration now to accede to his wishes. It is felt by many such control should have come at the same time as rent control, when they would have prevented real-estate prices from soaring fantastically.

It was almost 10 years ago that President Roosevelt raised the dramatic challenge of a third of a Nation ill-housed. Progress was made under his leadership, but we entered the war with an inadequate housing situation. We built over a million and a half permanent private and public dwellings during the war for essential workers, but neither the material nor the manpower could be spared from the war effort to keep pace with the country's total housing needs, to say nothing of catching up with the existing prewar shortage.

Touching on the housing shortage in his message to Congress President Truman said:

The largest single opportunity for rapid postwar expansion of private investment and employment lies in the field of housing. A decent standard of housing for all is one of the irreducible obligations of modern civilization. The housing challenge is now squarely before us. The people of the United States, so far ahead in wealth and productive capacity, deserve to be the best housed in the world. We must begin to meet that challenge at once.

I feel there has been too much delay since the President delivered his message to Congress. I believe the country is well equipped to do a building job of the size necessary to meet the problem. It is time we get started.

In Washington the prime need is for immediate legislation to provide for the unified approach on the part of the Fed-

eral Government which is needed to tackle effectively the present emergency.

Locally, it is the obligation of the communities to measure their need, map out plans and objectives, and mobilize their home forces on the problem along a front embracing industry, labor, the community, and the public who are prospective home builders.

At the same time we must face the hard facts that the Nation's housing supply is in a depleted condition. Government must be giving its attention to this problem and must find a way soon to start the flow of much-needed building material into the sections of the country where it is most needed.

Let us not make the mistake of looking at the housing shortage as a temporary problem. It is a long-range problem.

Housing is long lived—

It says in a report of the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Development—

and the improvement of housing conditions requires foresight and many years of planning and work. Housing is substantial and visible to all and determines a large part of the aspects of our cities and our countryside. Slums are not only a deterrent to the development of a sound citizenry, but they lower the people's desire for healthful and attractive surroundings and the hope of improving their conditions.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE PRO-SOVIET GOVERNMENT OF RUMANIA

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the press reports that the United States will recognize Premier Groza's pro-Soviet government of Rumania.

This is not news to the Communists. They have known for many weeks that this would be done.

I wish to call the attention of the Members of Congress to remarks which I inserted in the RECORD on November 6, 1945, in which I charged that our State Department was being "Stalined" and that it would seem that "we are no longer masters of our own house."

In the course of my remarks I quoted a dispatch from the New York Times written October 19 by Sam Pope Brewer to the effect that the appointment of Mark Ethridge to be special representative of the State Department to investigate conditions in the Balkans was paving the way for the recognition of the Groza government.

Now that we know that the State Department is making such a recommendation what more proof do we need that the Communists are dictating changes in policy and personnel to suit their purposes?

In my remarks of November 6, which are published on pages A4730 to A4732 of the Appendix of the RECORD, I outlined many reasons for my charge that the State Department was being "Stalined"



and warned that it was high time to call a halt to this alarming disintegration and infiltration of our most important Government Department.

Since making those remarks much has happened to bear out my charges which, incidentally, have never been answered by anyone in the State Department.

Frankly, the situation is becoming gravely alarming and this Congress should wait no longer to investigate and learn what is actually going on.

Only recently an open invitation was extended by George Seldes, editor of *In Fact*, Communist publication, to Communists within the State Department to reveal state secrets, when he wrote, in the issue of January 21:

Although the Benton directives are marked "secret" and "confidential" there are hundreds of State Department employees, the majority from the OWI and the OIAA (the former Rockefeller agency), who subscribe to the belief that they are American citizens first and State Department employees second. Unless the State Department sets up a United States gestapo to intimidate its employees into silence, the secret and confidential directives will continue to reach the light.

There are few Members of Congress who will not agree that when such an article can be written in America something should be done about it.

I urge Members of Congress to refer to my remarks of November 6, and consider what has happened since then.

The State Department has sent Soviet sympathizers as aides to General MacArthur. These include:

Former Assistant Secretary of War John J. McCloy, who pressed for the secret directives which permitted Communists to gain Army commissions and assignments to secret War Department posts. Another Red sympathizer, if not Communist, is Owen Lattimore, special economic adviser to Tokyo. Then there are Harold Glasser and Josiah DuBois. Glasser formerly was military research director in the Treasury and DuBois is a close friend. Glasser's wife was corresponding secretary of the League of Women Shoppers, which was regarded by the Special House Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist-front organization. Glasser himself was a member of another such organization, the Washington Committee for Democratic Action.

Among members of the party of civilian and military advisers with McCloy was John H. Vincent, one of the men who was included in the indictments of State Department employees for removing secret files.

The Washington Post, on October 25, 1945, said:

Both Lattimore and DuBois have definite convictions on rooting out of Jap militarism and building up a Japanese democracy.

James Angell, former Columbia University professor, now with the Foreign Economic Administration, has been named to carry on Pauley's work on European reparations. Angell is listed in appendix 9 of the Dies committee as being a fellow traveler.

Jack Burling of the Justice Department was sent to Tokyo to help prose-

cute Jap war criminals. Burling is the attorney who sought to intern and deport Jan Valtin, author of the book *Out of the Night*, based on charges of the Communists.

Julian Friedman, now in China for the State Department, is a pro-Communist.

As stated before, the Congress needs no more proof of what is going on than it already has in its possession. What are we waiting for?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

#### THE NATION'S WHEAT SUPPLY

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the President has recently issued an order to conserve the supply of food in this country, especially wheat. I am in sympathy with his desire to provide grain and other food for people who are on the verge of starvation.

The objective of this order is to furnish larger allocations for the starving people of other countries. The order provides, among other things, that distilleries and breweries shall not use wheat until further orders are issued, but does not prevent them from using other grains that are likewise needed for food.

It is extremely unfortunate that his directive has been made rather suddenly and without notice to our people, with respect to the entire problem involved. The people of this country should have been informed with regard to the seriousness of the situation and should also know approximately the plans of the administration, as to the amount of food we are expected to provide other countries, as well as the kind of food that ought to be sent and how much we can afford to provide for them. I feel that whatever food is allocated, it ought to be done promptly and with the least red tape and delay as possible.

Many months ago, other Members of this House, together with myself, called attention to the need of diverting grains for food that was consumed for liquor, it being our contention that it was more important that we have food than liquor.

During the past 5 years, millions of bushels of wheat, corn, and other grains have been used for making liquor. These grains should have been used for food. It would have greatly relieved the situation in which we find ourselves today.

I am informed there is about a 3½ years' supply of hard liquor on hand. No one, surely, can seriously complain if we cease making hard liquor for 2 or 3 years, or, at least, until this emergency is over.

A great amount of food can be saved if we divert all grain for food that is now going for liquor. I really believe people who are accustomed to the use of hard liquor will be willing to go along, especially in view of conditions.

Mr. Speaker, there is, after all, only a certain amount of food in this country. I do not believe the order directed to the millers and processors will provide as much additional food as might be expect-

ed. I doubt whether it will supply an increase in food that will offset the confusion that will come about in the milling and processing industries.

After all, wheat and other grains contain a certain amount of food value. Nearly all of the wheat processed goes directly for food under present operations. The remainder goes for feed and that in turn is fed to poultry and livestock to produce meat, that helps give a balanced food ration. It all goes for food either directly or indirectly.

I am anxious that this problem be worked out in a practical manner so that in the long run the biggest supply of food may be provided, not only for our own people, but to other countries where allocations are made. There is one important thing we can do, and that is quit wasting so much food.

I would like to add that I do not like the criticism that has been made to the effect that the farmers of this country have been hoarding wheat. An investigation will disclose that such is not the case. Farmers and producers have cooperated in every way they could and are doing it now. Statistics will show a normal supply of wheat in the hands of the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, the President's order should have been made only after a report was made to the people of this country as to conditions of people where the food is allocated. An estimate of the needs of the countries and people where the food is to be allocated. Then have an estimate of our supplies, and an estimate of our own needs and requirements.

In other words, let the American people have a fair picture of the whole situation. They have a right to all this information, and ought to have it.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] who is quite familiar with this problem.

Mr. CARLSON. I am fearful that many of our people believe that large stocks of grain are being withheld on the farms of this Nation. It is true a large amount of this grain has not been moved because of the shortage of cars; but I checked with the grain market at Kansas City and found that in January of 1946 they received 4,960 carloads of wheat, which is the largest receipts in the history of the grain market at Kansas City. Not only that but for the first 7 months of the crop year of 1945 they received 50,664 cars, which is the second largest carlot receipt of wheat in our grain market's history at Kansas City, showing that the farmers are shipping wheat to market and it is not the result of hoarding on the farm that we get this scare about the shortage of wheat.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Kansas. He comes from one of the greatest wheat-producing districts in the United States and he has given this matter a great deal of study. I am in accord with his view when he says that the farmers of this country are not hoarding wheat. We have no more than the usual supply

of wheat on the farms at this time of the year in the State of Kansas or in the country as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, it should be remembered, too, that we have heretofore imported some wheat into our country during recent years but now we are exporting wheat.

Wheat is going out of this country faster than we realize. What I would like to get across to the membership of this House is that the President's plan comes rather suddenly and without sufficient careful study. We should have the information I have outlined in my statement. The plan will not bring the results that the President hopes may be accomplished.

Mr. CARLSON. May I say that I agree with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] about this new order. It will not result in getting food supplies for our own people and for our allies across the seas. I think the President was sold a bill of goods without thoroughly studying this problem. As a matter of fact, the Department of Agriculture figures show that we had 689,000,000 bushels of wheat on hand on January 1, 1946. Allowing 89,000,000 bushels for the month of January, that will leave 600,000,000 bushels until July 1 of this year. We are going to use about 200,000,000 bushels for flour, 50,000,000 for seed for spring wheat, which will leave 350,000,000 bushels as a carry-over for food and for export.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Out of that 350,000,000 bushels, I understand we have agreed to allocate something like 225,000,000 bushels to Europe.

Mr. CARLSON. The gentleman is correct. Everyone will agree that as much as we might want to send 225,000,000 bushels over there between now and July 1, it is a physical impossibility to do so because of transportation. This order, which upsets our mills, our grain markets and our baking is unfortunate and was acted on with undue haste.

SALINA, KANS., February 7, 1946.

HON. FRANK CARLSON,  
House of Representatives:

I repeat telegram I have just sent to the President: "In behalf of the wheat growers, the flour millers, the bakers and the consuming public, we wish to protest the order requiring 80 percent extraction flour. In our opinion this move will cause tremendous damage without producing the result hoped for. It is also a disappointment that in view of the manner in which the milling industry has at all times cooperated in the Government program that such an order should be issued without prior consultation with the industry in our opinion the order will not make available additional food for Europe. It is urged that the action be reconsidered and that you avail yourself of the judgment of representative millers in attaining the ends desired without a drastic dislocation which we hope will not be effective."

ELMER W. REED,

Vice President and General Manager,  
The Shellabarger Mills.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's views. Let me assert again that we want to do the best we can in helping the starving people of foreign countries. We know that they need food and that the situation is perhaps even more critical than we realize, but this

situation should have been carefully studied and worked out with respect to the amount of food we are expected to provide to the foreign countries and which people need it most. We should know more about the whole over-all picture. I am informed that we have little to say about the allocation and distribution of our food after it reaches foreign countries. We should see to it that it goes to the people who need it most and with as little red tape as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I do not suggest any delay in dealing with this matter. There has been a lot of delay in getting at it. I do hope the President provides us, from the information at hand, his plans with respect to the amounts of food promised or expected to be furnished to the various countries of the world. Also an estimate of our own supplies of food and food products. In other words, give the American people a little clearer picture of the whole situation. They are vitally interested in this matter. Then let him go on down the line and withdraw from the liquor industry grain of all kinds. Corn is just about as valuable as wheat for food purposes. Other grains, too, are needed for food purposes. Withdraw the grain from these distilleries until our situation is a whole lot better than it is now because, as I said before, grain is certainly more important for food than it is for liquor, especially when we do not have an adequate supply of grain.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in my remarks a telegram that the President received from Elmer Reed, one of the outstanding millers and grain operators in the Middle West.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, very few who desire to aid in feeding the hungry people in other parts of the world will disagree with the gentleman from Kansas that if it comes to a show-down bread is far more important than beer or whisky, no matter how much some may dislike seeing the supply of it undiminished.

If there is anyone who knows anything about the wheat situation and the possibility of sending increased supplies abroad, certainly the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], who we all hope will be the next Governor of Kansas, know that subject. Not knowing anything about wheat farming nor the amount we have on hand nor how it should be made into bread, nor how much of our wheat can go abroad—here is the point, and I would like the opinion of my friends from Kansas. I will read this letter which gives you a picture of a farm organization in southwestern Michigan. All during the war,

while the farm boys were being drafted and sent abroad, old men and old women, not as old as I am, but some of them 65 and better, up to 70—yes, some 80—instead of complying with union rules and doing but 40 or 48 hours work a week, were driving tractors with lights on them over the fields at night, putting in 12 and 14 hours, some of them; some doing what my other friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] calls "stoop work" down in the swamps, planting and weeding onions, cauliflower, cabbage, and crops of that kind. And they did produce an enormous amount of foodstuffs. Here is what this gentleman says that bears upon our present situation. He wrote:

We have just received a notice of cancellation of 250 tons of ammonia nitrate fertilizer after these orders had been accepted last fall. Now, due to conditions beyond the suppliers' control, these have been canceled.

We are advised by Mr. J. W. Wizeman, Chemical Division, Civilian Production Administration, Social Security Building, Washington, D. C., has removed from American civilian use 10,000 tons of ammonium fertilizer to be given to UNRRA for use in China, and 60,000 tons of potash for UNRRA for use in foreign countries.

Besides the above cancellations of ammonium we also had canceled today 10 cars of fertilizer containing potash mixtures. It is regrettable that our farmers, who during the depression years depleted their soil to a large extent because of poor prices, are not now able to secure these materials. For the past several years during the war every effort was made by them to help the war effort. Now with the war over, everyone is sadly disappointed, desiring to produce as good a crop as possible, not being able to do so due to Mr. Wizeman's allocation to UNRRA.

Won't you contact this gentleman?

I did call Mr. Wizeman. He said he did not know anything about the situation but would investigate at once and learn what, if anything, could be done. He was very kind about it and I am sure he will try to remedy the trouble.

I will say to my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] that is just one of those many errands which we are so happy to do for our constituents, whether it is getting them tractor tires, plow points, a harrow, or a rake to go out in the garden to produce vegetables for home use and cut down the cost of living. I am glad to perform those tasks.

Permit me to read:

We had one grower in this afternoon who had his soil analyzed and they advised him that he should use an 0-9-27 mixture. What good is it for a farmer to have his soil analyzed by the Government agency and then find out that because of another Government agency's ruling he cannot get the fertilizer?

When the President made his order about bread someone who advised him should have taken into consideration—maybe they did, I do not know—the question of whether the Chinaman over there with his hand labor can produce a greater tonnage of crops of greater food value if he gets all this fertilizer than can be produced by our farmers here at home if they use it and then we ship the grain grown over there.

I would like to know from my Kansas friends, just being an agriculturist and not a real farmer, whether we can con-



tinue to grow crops, sow the seed, harvest the grain, and take away from the land forever without coming to the end and being unable to comply with the President's request.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to say that the distinguished gentleman who now has the floor is well informed with respect to farmers' problems and has at all times taken a deep interest in agricultural matters. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has on many occasions risen to speak on the floor of this House in defense and on behalf of the farmers of his State and of this country, and has many times called attention to the fact that the farmers of our country could not have provided the food they have produced if it had not been that they and their wives and their children worked not only 8 or 12 hours a day, but 18 hours a day in many cases in order to provide food not only for our own people and for our armed forces but for our allies abroad as well.

I want to pay tribute to the gentleman who has the floor for the splendid way in which he has at all times defended and protected and tried in every way he could to help the farmers of this country. As he has suggested, American farmers have performed a magnificent service without a whimper of complaint. They have been short of implements with which to farm, on many occasions, and have of course been short of the fertilizer which is so much needed.

With respect to the question of fertilizer, there is no question of doubt but that our farmers, especially in the State from which the gentleman comes, are in dire need of fertilizer. While it may be well for us to divide with other countries of the world we certainly cannot provide the food we are asked to produce unless we have a supply of fertilizer. One of the most essential things we need for growing food is fertilizer. We have not had an adequate supply for 3 or 4 years. So, as I said in the remarks I made a few minutes ago, we ought to get full and complete information from the agencies concerned to find out what supplies we have on hand and what allocations are being made. We cannot give away all our fertilizer and expect to raise crops to feed our own people and share in feeding the people of the world as well. Let us be fair and reasonable about it and find out where we stand with respect to this problem. We want to help these people, of course we do, but we cannot give away all of our fertilizer or anything else that is necessary to produce our crops and then expect an abundance of food for our people and those of foreign countries.

I appreciate the gentleman's calling our attention to this important matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman. The thing that is worrying my correspondent is that, knowing as he does that the farmers in that vicinity, and that is all of southwestern Michigan, have been short of farm machinery—they cannot buy tractors, they cannot

buy plows, they cannot buy harrows. Much of that machinery is short because of the strike in the International Harvester Co.'s plants. Now, the old folks can do something, and they have performed marvelously, but they cannot put the fertilizer in the ground if they cannot buy it. That is what is worrying my friend. That is what I have taken up with the Department. I hope the gentleman will back my efforts and just convince Mr. Wizeman, and I am sure he is willing to be convinced, that there is no use in sowing wheat on sand or on muck or even on good ground unless the farmer has fertilizer now and then.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will be glad to cooperate in any way I can to see that the farmers of this country are provided with a reasonable amount of fertilizer and much-needed farm machinery.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will be glad to go along with the gentleman when it comes to this question of bread versus beer and whisky.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman for his cooperation with respect to this problem.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5135. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 314. An act for the relief of Sigurdur Jonsson and Thorolína Thordardóttir;

S. 1101. An act for the relief of the estate of Manuel Rose Lima; and

S. 1480. An act for the relief of Charles R. Hooper.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 1089) entitled "An act for the relief of Albert Cantalupo," disagreed to by the House, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. MORSE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2223) entitled "An act for the relief of Catherine Bode," disagreed to by the House, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. WILEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2267) entitled "An act for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley," disagreed to by the House, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. O'DANIEL, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. WHERRY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the

bill (H. R. 2487) entitled "An act for the relief of Mrs. S. P. Burton," disagreed to by the House, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. MORSE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 380) entitled "An act to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment and full production in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government."

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Navy.
2. Department of War.
3. Post Office Department.
4. Federal Works Agency.
5. Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAVAGE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### OPA AND THE STRIKE SITUATION

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, despite newspaper headlines which would lead us to believe that nearly all the country's workers are on strike, we now have over 52,000,000 workers on the job—more than ever before in America's peacetime history. Instead of leading us to believe that the economy is about to crack up, why do the papers not remind the country that a much smaller percentage of our workers are on strike today than there was in the peak of the strike in 1919? Fight now only about 1 out of 50 of our workers are on strike.

Even though the country may be riled to almost hysteria over such yellow journalism and radio stories, Members of Congress should remain in a cool and judicious mood.

Let us consider for the moment the actual cause of the present wave of strikes. During the war the workers made a no-strike pledge and lived up to it better than 99 percent. Their wages were held down by the Little Steel formula, which permitted a wage raise not to exceed 15 percent above January 1941. In the meantime, the cost of living for workers' families had gone up about 50 percent, but the workers were still able to manage as long as they were still getting overtime in war production. But when their income was suddenly cut by the loss of 6 days' wages per month, by the loss of overtime, coupled with inflation, it made it practically impossible for the workers to provide for their families. Their purchasing power amounted

to a little more than half of what it did with the overtime, prior to the drastic raise in the cost of living.

In the meantime, the workers had watched our Nation's corporations pile up the greatest profits in the history of the Nation. This, also, brought some resentment because our people did not want to see war profiteering.

The natural thing for the worker to do, and the only thing he could do, was to ask for more wages. The requests for wage increases were turned down by the corporations which the Congress had so kindly provided with carry-back tax provisions that would allow them to pay dividends without producing by drawing on the United States Treasury.

Americans, whether workers or soldiers, are of the same courageous, pioneering spirit. They are of the same courageous stock that braved all kinds of hazards to build a free country—to see that all people are treated equally. American workers are not the weak, spineless creatures that are going to bow down to corporate wealth and vested interests.

Being denied higher wages and refusing to take desperate cuts in their living standards at a time when the Nation was more prosperous than it ever was before, the workers could do nothing less than use their only weapon—to strike. The picture is very plain. Inflation is the real cause of the strikes. Of course, it could have been prevented for a while if the big companies would have been willing to divide some of their excess profits with their employees.

And I want to again direct your attention to the speech made on the floor by the gentleman from West Virginia, Congressman NEELY, Friday, February 1, 1946, page 756 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where he points out the excessive salaries being paid out to corporation officials.

It is the organized workers who protect the American standard of living. The floor under living standards below which organized workers refuse to go without striking becomes what is commonly called the American standard of living. Farm income is governed largely by what the workers receive. The amendment that was proposed February 4 to the Case bill by the Republican gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] would completely abolish the workers' right to strike. Should Congress depress the workers' standard of living with any such oppressive legislation, the farm income would also immediately drop. Business of our entire Nation depends upon the purchasing power of these two major economic groups. When their income falls down goes the prosperity of the Nation.

So, gentlemen, I submit that what we do here to curb labor's freedom, the freedom to refuse to go below a certain standard of living, will also curb the prosperity and living standards of the whole Nation to a very similar degree. It well behooves us to legislate with calm and cool judgment without being carried away on a false hysteria whipped up by someone trying to write sensational headlines about ordinary stories. Although many independent newspapers have refrained

from such journalism, we all must realize that the big chain newspapers have always been antilabor and, of course, they write their headlines accordingly. Just keep in mind that America became great with free labor.

A lot has been said lately about mutual responsibilities to a contract. We have that now. As many contracts are violated by employers as are violated by employees. The inference is, of course, that the workers violate a contract every time they strike. Such is not the case. Some working agreements contain a clause stating that the workers have the right to strike. In such a case, the strike would be in accordance with the working agreement and not in violation of it. Some contracts provide that if the parties have not reached an agreement after a certain period of negotiating, the workers may strike at will. It is very seldom that contracts are written so workers cannot strike for the life of the agreement.

Many are saying we should crush unions because they are not democratic. Almost without exception, unions adopt a national or an international constitution and then the local unions, chartered under the parent organization, adopt local bylaws.

Unions usually hold weekly or semi-monthly regular meetings and many special meetings. A large portion of the members are democratically elected to serve as officers or on committees or boards. Practically all unions urge the members to attend the meetings. Records are kept of the business conducted for all members to refer to. No other organizations demand such frequent reports to the membership by their officers as do labor unions, and no other organization is so quick to criticize an official who acts contrary to the wishes of the membership.

Many contended, while advocating the passage of the Smith-Connally bill, that if the workers could vote there would be no strikes, that it was just the officials leading the workers out on strike against their will. The country now has ample proof that such contention was in error. The Smith-Connally votes have been overwhelmingly to strike. In fact it legalized strikes.

I have been a member of many clubs and organizations, but none are so democratically controlled as a labor union. Parliamentary rules are seldom used to take a speaker off his feet or to prevent him from speaking as many times as he likes. Unions are a little too democratic, if anything. They do too much of the business in membership meetings, that often makes the meetings too long. Union meetings are very educational. We should all attend a few because there we could really learn about human problems.

Most unions elect their officers by secret ballot following nominations in a membership meeting or a convention. No corporation has enough democracy to compare in any way with that of a labor union.

I think, at this point, I ought to describe what is meant by labor when it is used in this sense.

In the first place, we have over 52,000,000 workers in the United States now,

I believe that it would be conservative to say that workers and their families make up considerably more than 100,000,000 of our population. Perhaps three-fourths of the population could be considered as labor, because when we say labor, we mean the workers and their families. So when you hear someone say we have to crush labor in order to protect the public, they are actually saying that we have to crush labor in order to protect labor. It just does not make sense.

Now let us consider what has caused inflation. Of course, the scarcity of goods is really the only thing that can make inflation possible, but inflation can be prevented by controlling prices. All during the war and since its end labor has been urging strong price controls. Women's organizations have written many letters and adopted many resolutions urging strong price control. Labor papers have been constantly urging that we hold the price line. Professional people have been doing the same thing. Government employees, teachers, and other workers who have been on a set salary, have been urging that we hold the line on the cost of living. Now we have many businessmen joining forces to curb inflation. President Roosevelt constantly urged Congress to prevent inflation and hold down the cost of living. He was always pointing out the danger of inflation.

President Roosevelt's supporters in Congress tried to control prices, but they were not always able to maintain a majority. Sometimes a coalition, the same one that President Truman recently referred to, of Republicans and some reactionary southern poll-tax Democrats, were able to muster a majority and weaken the price-control program. This was accomplished mainly by cutting appropriations to OPA, like was done on June 17, 1944, when the House cut \$4,500,000 off the OPA appropriations.

This wrecking crew, on June 27, 1945, cut \$6,000,000 from OPA appropriations without rhyme or reason. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] offered an amendment to restore the full amount, which was defeated. I took notes of that off the record vote that defeated Mr. SABATH's amendment and saw that the Republicans stood up in a solid bloc against the amendment. That is what happened when OPA needed money to head off the black market.

The price-control program has also been hampered by weakening amendments, such as the Taft amendment, adopted in July 1943, which prevents grade labeling. Another such amendment is the Republican amendment introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY] in 1944, which reads as follows:

That no regulation, order, or price schedule issued under this act shall, after the effective date of this subsection, require any seller of goods at retail to limit his sales with reference to highest-price line offered for sale by him at any prior time.

Also on June 27, 1945, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], a Republican, offered an amendment to make an additional cut from OPA funds—\$1,600,000. Fortunately this amend-



ment was defeated, as were many other amendments offered by the Republicans which were intended to cripple or destroy the price-control program. A number of Republican amendments that have been adopted are very minor compared to the number that they have attempted to pass. I could enumerate such amendments at length. In fact, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is full of Republican speeches against OPA. It seems that every derogatory editorial they could find about OPA is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. However, I guess the Republicans in Congress, in this destructive work against OPA, are only following Republican leaders of the country, because I have here a newspaper article from the Washington Post of February 3, which says:

GOP leaders in Midwest make abolition of OPA for No. 1 objective.

It says:

Republican chairman of the 12 Midwestern States today pledged themselves to campaign for immediate elimination of the OPA.

These Republican leaders are entirely out of line as to what the people of the Nation want in regard to price control. For 3 years the Republicans have been using OPA as a political target. They have been trying to appeal to the prejudices that they think the people ought to have against price control. I am glad to see that the public is taking a much more intelligent position in their attitude toward preventing inflation despite Republican propaganda to the contrary.

At the conclusion of my remarks, I am including a joint statement presented to the Special House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning by 14 different national women's organizations. These organizations represent many thousands of women throughout the country and their statement shows that they are using more rigid price control and a greater effort to prevent inflation. The Republicans have either made a bad guess or else they are deliberately trying to sabotage the administration's price-control program, hoping to reap the political benefits of its failure. I think the Republicans should have put the war effort of reconversion and the general welfare of the country ahead of politics.

I do not mean to say that OPA has not been able to do some good. I think it has done a lot of good, because if it had not been for OPA the cost of living would probably be two or three times as high as it is, judging from what happened to prices in a much shorter time in World War I, when we had no price control. But I say it is definitely Congress' fault that a better job has not been done.

If there is inefficiency in OPA it has been brought about by Congress through the efforts of the Republicans and a few antiadministration Democrats. But OPA gets the blame for it.

You will find that the present strike situation is only a ripple compared to the tempest of strikes that will prevail if the Republicans succeed in carrying out their pledge to abolish OPA.

Now I have just shown you how the high cost of living was brought about

because of the Republican fight against price control, and I have shown you that this inflation is the direct cause of the present strike situation. This indisputable evidence, taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, shows that the Republicans in Congress are directly to blame for the conditions causing the present strikes.

These same forces, who are responsible for the strike condition, have been on this floor for the last several days making speeches against labor and proposing bills and amendments to crush free labor. They have been blaming labor for things they are responsible for.

This Republican travesty, known as the Case bill, has grown out of weaknesses in Congress. While the present economic conditions prevail we can no more solve our industrial disputes by crushing the workers right to strike and compelling them to submit to a lower standard of living than we could put out a fire by pouring water on the smoke.

The Congress has passed a terrible burden to the administration. The President is going to have to try to solve our present economic problems by making some basic economic changes to help until our economy is again stabilized. Our system of free collective bargaining between labor and management worked very well before inflation hit and it would work the same way again when they get rid of this inflationary period. The present condition is only temporary. And I believe that any governmental interference in any labor-management relations should be only temporary. But some of the very people who are to blame for the cause of this industrial strife are shouting the loudest to crush labor forever. The few dollars saved by the Republicans cutting down funds for OPA is now costing the Nation many millions of dollars per day. In addition to millions in inflationary costs the strikes alone are costing in wages, and so forth, nearly \$20,000,000 a day.

Mr. Speaker, now to prove that the Republican fight against OPA is contrary to the wishes of the people of the United States, I ask unanimous consent to include this joint statement which was presented to the Special House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning by 14 national women's organizations:

JOINT STATEMENT PRESENTED TO THE SPECIAL HOUSE COMMITTEE ON POSTWAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

By the American Association of University Women, American Home Economics Association, Consumers Union of the United States, Inc., League of Women Shoppers, Inc., National Consumers League, National Council of Catholic Women, National Council of Jewish Women, National Council of Negro Women, Non-Partisan Council on Public Affairs of the A. K. Sorority, National Women's Trade Union League, Potomac Cooperative Federation, National Federation of Settlements, National League of Women Voters, and the General Federation of Women's Clubs, January 31, 1946.

THE URGENT NEED FOR IMMEDIATE EXTENSION OF PRICE AND RENT CONTROLS

This joint statement is presented in behalf of American consumers, who believe that immediate renewal by the Congress of the price- and rent-control legislation which expires on June 30 is an essential prerequisite

for the Nation's successful transition to high level postwar employment, production, and national income. Our country is faced with the imminent threat of a runaway price and rent inflation, unless Congress serves notice that the line will be held by continuing price control until at least June 30, 1947, and rent control until at least June 30, 1948.

President Truman has warned the Congress and the Nation that pent-up inflationary pressures have reached the critical explosion point. Wherever there are no controls, major inflationary price advances have taken place. The prices of uncontrolled urban real estate have risen more than 50 percent since the beginning of the war. In the absence of adequate controls on speculation industrial stock prices have more than doubled since the spring of 1942.

Five months after VJ-day, the overriding economic fact is that for a considerable period to come, we face a sellers' market in consumer durable goods, clothing, and housing. Cumulative shortages will not be overcome even at high levels of production for a couple of years in consumer durables, and in housing the shortage may continue for a decade. In the face of such major and acute shortages, record-breaking demand will precipitate an inflationary explosion unless prices are held down, until the supply of scarce goods comes into approximate balance with postwar demand.

The Nation's experience after World War I underscores the pressing need for renewing and maintaining price and rent controls. Although the pent-up demand at that time was much less than today, an inflationary price advance was generated when the Government dropped all controls after the armistice. The cost of living soared and reached a peak 108 percent above the prewar level. The purchasing power of the dollar dropped to 40 cents, as 43 percent of the general price inflation and 91 percent of the rise in rents came after the war was over.

The American people have not forgotten the World War I inflation which ended in an economic crash and an acute depression. By 1920 industrial production fell 40 percent in 1 year, farm prices dropped 50 percent and the prices of manufactured goods declined 45 percent. The American people are determined that they will not again suffer the disastrous consequences of a postwar inflationary boom-and-bust cycle. That is why they support the President's appeal for the continuation of price and rent controls to keep the lid on speculative price advances.

We cannot afford to forget that the inflationary threat today is far more dangerous than it was back in 1919. The pent-up demand for civilian goods has been conservatively but incompletely estimated at \$50,000,000,000, chiefly for consumer durables and housing. Everywhere on the price front ceilings are at the cracking point. Without price and rent controls, the fuse would be set for the worst inflationary explosion in our history.

More than that, unless price and rent controls are renewed as soon as possible the country will be threatened with another sellers' strike that will cripple reconversion. Last fall some manufacturers and businessmen held back goods from the market because they wanted to make windfall profits this year after the repeal of the excess-profits tax. Unless Congress immediately makes clear that price and rent controls will be renewed, there is grave danger that many manufacturers, builders and other businessmen will curb production and construction and hold back goods in anticipation of higher prices after the end of price control.

Your committee which has been studying postwar economic policy should consider the threat to the Nation, if a sellers' strike should develop in the next few months just when the largest possible expansion of civilian

production is needed. This potential danger illustrates how the transition to the peacetime economy with high levels of employment and production necessarily must be safeguarded by price and rent controls.

In fact, reconversion was hampered and inflationary pressures were increased when essential controls were dropped by the Government after VJ-day. These mistakes led to hoarding of scarce materials, to the sellers' strike and to sharp intensification of the housing shortage. The fact is that it was not the retention of wartime controls but their premature abolition that slowed down reconversion. If controls had not been removed prematurely, there would have been no basis for the sellers' strike.

The renewal and extension of price and rent controls will safeguard, not harm, reconversion. If businessmen and consumers know that the lid will be kept down on inflationary price increases, they can plan their operations and expenditures for 1946 and 1947. The businessman will know that it will pay him to get capacity operations going as quickly as possible in a sellers' market where he can sell everything he can turn out. And the consumer will purchase what he needs, and not scramble for everything in sight because the value of the dollar is going down from week to week.

It is generally agreed that the most effective defense against inflation is capacity production. But maximum output will not be attained if it will be more profitable for businessmen to hoard stocks of materials and products, because they will receive higher prices and make bigger profits further along the inflationary spiral. Business and industry are guaranteed markets for all they can produce in the next several years—if prices do not get out of control. With capacity operations, they will make the greatest profits they have ever earned. And high level production will gradually ease and dissipate the inflationary pressures that were generated during the war. At some safe point in this process, the inflationary threat will have been defeated and price controls can be abolished.

The issue, therefore, is not the abolition of price and rent controls. No one proposes that they be continued indefinitely. The real issue is to avoid inflation and that cannot be done without the continuation of price and rent controls. What has happened since VJ-day shows that we would be courting economic disaster if these controls were abolished before we were certain that the inflation threat has been definitely overcome. It will be incomparably better for the economic welfare of the Nation, if the controls are removed 6 months after they are no longer needed than 6 months too soon when there may still be danger that inflation will get out of hand.

This conclusion becomes inescapable when we examine the situation in food where the supply picture is better than in any other group of commodities or goods. Prices are pressing very hard against ceilings even in those foods where supplies are relatively ample. For example, last November OPA lifted the ceilings on fresh citrus fruits in response to appeals from the industry. Within a week or so, retail prices doubled in many communities. Here was a laboratory test proving that in the absence of a ceiling, the price of a commodity in relatively good supply will have an inflationary rise because of the abnormal conditions that now prevail in the economy.

What was true of citrus fruits would also apply to consumer durables, to clothing, to housing, to most foods. Current price ceilings are actually a floor below which prices do not fall, no matter what the available supply. Consequently, the elimination of ceilings would pave the way for major price increases of 25, 50, and 100 percent in a year. What we would have for all practical purposes would be the price conditions of a national black market, with constant upbidding of

prices and the whole speculative, inflationary process legitimized by the ending of price and rent controls.

In the face of this threat to our future, with the prospect of having the peace undermined by a catastrophic depression in 1 or 2 years, theoretical arguments against price and rent controls cannot be taken seriously. It is not a question of being for or against price and rent controls. The line-up is actually for or against inflation. On the one hand, we have the overwhelming majority of our citizens against inflation and for price and rent controls. On the other hand, there are a small number of selfish interests willing to gamble with the economic health of the Nation by playing around with what they call a small dose of inflation. But inflation cannot be taken in controlled doses. Once price and rent controls are abolished prematurely, there will be a galloping inflation with disaster as its inevitable end.

Because of their critical importance, it is essential that Congress reject all efforts to emasculate price and rent controls through amendments. Consumers are especially concerned over the drive to cripple or abolish OPA's cost-absorption principle. OPA is applying this policy in line with the President's Executive Order 9599 which directed the Price Administrator "so far as reasonable, practicable and necessary" to see to it that unavoidable manufacturing price increases do not cause prices increases at later levels of distribution.

Without the principle of cost absorption, we would have price control in name only. Substantial price increases would take place in the cost of food, clothing, reconversion goods, and dozens of other cost-of-living items. Even worse, abolition of cost absorption would pyramid price increases throughout the economy, as one increase after the other would be passed along to subsequent economic levels, thus putting the inflationary spiral into motion, whether we continued to have a price-control law on the statute books or not.

A cost-plus formula as a substitute for cost absorption would simply mean a formula for legalized inflation. Price control requires holding down prices. When some unavoidable manufacturing increases can be absorbed, they must be absorbed in whole or in part as an integral part of the price-control program. But you cannot have price control unless there is partial or complete absorption of cost increases at some level of economic activity, so that the full impact is not felt by the consumer in the form of ever-higher inflationary retail price increases.

We believe your committee in its deliberations on postwar economic policy should recommend to the House of Representatives that it renew the price and rent-control legislation as soon as possible. This legislation by stabilizing the economy during the transition back to peacetime production will help us construct a solid foundation for postwar prosperity.

We believe that the price-control provisions should be extended until at least June 30, 1947. That will give business and industry about a year and a half in which to take the edge off the current abnormal demand. Along with renewal of the price-control provisions, it is essential that the Second War Powers Act be renewed until at least June 30, 1947. This act is the basis for the Government's priority and inventory controls. Without these controls, hoarding of scarce materials will block the channels of distribution, with consequent pressure on the entire price structure.

We believe that the rent-control provisions should be renewed until at least June 30, 1948. Housing is our most critical shortage and the present crisis will not be overcome in the next 2 years. Renewal of rent controls until at least June 30, 1948, will reassure our people that there will be no rent inflation. It will also stimulate hous-

ing construction if builders realize that they cannot sit out rent control in the hope that it will be ended in 6 or 12 months.

If rent control is to be effective, we must have ceilings on the prices of new and old housing. We already have a major inflation in real-estate prices. Unless it is checked at once by congressional action, spiraling housing prices will exert such pressure on the rest of the economy that the whole reconversion stabilization program will break down.

Finally, we believe that the consumer food subsidy program must be continued until at least June 30, 1947. Instead of declining after VJ-day, food prices today are at their maximum ceiling levels. If the consumer food subsidy program is not continued, the cost of food to the average family will go up about 10 percent after July 1, thus raising the over-all cost of living by 4 percent. These increases would be only the beginning of a spiral of price rises, and consumers as after World War I would face the prospect of retail food prices skyrocketing to a peak more than 125 percent above the prewar level. With the consumer subsidy program this inflationary danger could be blocked until food demand and price levels were stabilized.

We have presented our views to your committee because we believe that immediate action along the lines we have indicated is a necessary prerequisite for a successful postwar economic policy. No postwar economic program will succeed if it is not based on meeting and curbing the inflationary threat now. Your committee can render a great service to the future welfare of the Nation by requesting the House of Representatives and its appropriate committees to consider the urgent need for immediate extension of price and rent controls, the Second War Powers Act and the consumer food subsidy program, and the enactment of legislation for imposing ceilings on the prices of new and old housing.

Kathryn McHale, General Director, American Association of University Women; Lelia Massey, Executive Secretary, American Home Economics Association; Colston E. Warne, President, Consumers Union of the United States, Inc.; Katherine Armatage, Chairman, League of Women Shoppers, Inc.; Elizabeth S. Magee, General Secretary, National Consumers League; Ruth Craven, Executive Secretary, National Council of Catholic Women; Mrs. Joseph M. Welt, President, National Council of Jewish Women; Mary McLeod Bethune, President, National Council of Negro Women; Thomassina Johnson, Legislative Representative, Non-Partisan Council on Public Affairs of the A. K. A. Sorority; Elisabeth Christman, Secretary-Treasurer, National Women's Trade Union League; Helmuth F. Kern, Executive Secretary, Potomac Cooperative Federation; Mildred Gutwillig, Chairman, Consumer Interest Committee, National Federation of Settlements; Anna Lord Strauss, President, National League of Women Voters; Mrs. La Fell Dickinson, President, General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAVAGE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I wonder if the gentleman has ever read the hearings held by the Smith committee where representatives of several thousand CIO workers of the garment industry came down and protested because of the OPA ruling



which closed factories which were manufacturing low-price clothing of quality. They complained bitterly because of that ruling. Beyond any question, that ruling did drive low-price garments of good quality off the market and threw those men out of their jobs.

Mr. SAVAGE. I know about that ruling. I know the CIO people did come to Congress and ask that that ruling be changed because the employer had offered them a raise if they could only do that. They wanted the rule changed. They wanted the rule changed because they were the real, low-income group in the textile industry and they really did need the raise.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They needed it in order to live, did they not?

Mr. SAVAGE. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And that rule put the manufacturer out of business; so, finally, they were out of jobs.

Mr. SAVAGE. That is right. I am saying there is some inefficiency in the OPA, but I am saying also that Congress is to blame for not giving sufficient money to do a more efficient job.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAVAGE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I gather from your statement that you have been or now are a member of some union, and so you speak from first-hand knowledge.

Mr. SAVAGE. I have been in the past a member of several different unions.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do those men representing the unions who announce the results of these votes, men like Reuther, and Thomas, and other officials, when the men are on strike, do they draw their compensation from the union just the same, while the workers in the plants who do not get pay checks are out?

Mr. SAVAGE. In most cases the top officials draw monthly salaries, and they do continue to draw their salaries while the workers are on strike. But in some cases I have known, where unions were short of funds, when the officials did not draw any wages. In fact, I knew one official one time, where they were on strike, where the union owed him a thousand dollars. He kept on doing the same efficient work.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman have any information as to the amount Mr. Reuther draws per year? Is it not true the CIO 600 in Detroit has an expense account of a thousand dollars a month for the use of one official?

Mr. SAVAGE. I do not know about that, but I do know that you can take the top three highest-paid officials which are \$25,000, \$20,000, and \$18,000, and the three of them still receive less than one-seventh of what the president of General Motors receives per year.

Mr. HOFFMAN. General Motors, as a whole, provides quite a number of jobs—several hundred thousand, does it not?

Mr. SAVAGE. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And the presidents of these unions do not provide any jobs or control any pay rolls for industrial workers?

Mr. SAVAGE. The union officials do make jobs in this way: They help keep up the buying power of the worker so that his purchasing power helps keep the farmers prosperous, and he creates a great many jobs by his ability to buy things. The prosperity of the farmers depends upon the prosperity of the workers. It is the workers who defend and protect the American standard of living. By refusing to work for anything less than a certain wage, they set the standard. If they were to work at any price that any employer wanted to pay, any low wage, a competitor of the company would be forced to cut wages in order to keep going, and the workers' wages would be so low that they would not be able to purchase, and the farm income would go down. When you lower the standard of those two large economic groups you lower the entire national prosperity.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SAVAGE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Conceding that philosophy, as far as it goes, to be correct, and that the farmer cannot produce without fairly good wages so that the workers can buy his products, after all, the farmers and the rest of us pay those wages, do we not?

Mr. SAVAGE. That is right. We all pay the wages for the commodity that we purchase. If you stop the purchasing power of the workers, you stop all prosperity. In fact, when we speak of labor in this sense we are talking about over 52,000,000 workers in this country at the present time. It is very conservative to say that they are connected with more than 100,000,000 people in America and including the families of this country—52,000,000 workers.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield right there? Then I will try to avoid interrupting further.

Mr. SAVAGE. I do not mind the gentleman's interrupting.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Of those 52,000,000 workers no one claims that more than 15,000,000 are organized. All the balance are unorganized. Is not that right?

Mr. SAVAGE. That is right, but usually when the organized workers better their standard of living it automatically helps the unorganized workers to raise their standard of living, too. So the organized workers in a way represent all workers.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I agree with the gentleman, but here is what is happening: We have what we may call an aristocracy of workers, for example, in steel, electrical equipment, and in General Motors. Those wages are up, way up, compared to some others. General Motors, we will say, because of its large capital can purchase machines which do the work of many, many men, but here is a smaller industry that employs maybe 10, 15, 50, or 100; that man or corporation cannot compete with General Motors, or the suppliers of General Motors. For example, I know one concern in my own district where some workers get \$2.48 an hour. It is a small town, too. I know other places near there where the business just will not stand the traffic and the worker cannot get over a dollar an hour.

Is it not true that when you pay these high wages in some localities to some certain trades it is putting out of business the smaller industries?

Mr. SAVAGE. It is true that some companies cannot pay as high wages as others, but the fact that there are those who can pay high wages does help to raise the ability of other companies to pay, because of additional prosperity in the Nation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there before he proceeds further?

Mr. SAVAGE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman says that some of the trouble grows out of amendments to OPA.

Mr. SAVAGE. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And the gentleman is saying now that the Republicans are to blame. What I cannot get through my head is that as long as we have 435 Members in the House and the Democrats have an overwhelming majority and are responsible for what legislation comes out of here, you lay it to us.

Mr. SAVAGE. I thank the gentleman for bringing the point up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan raises a very pertinent point there, because I had the opportunity of telling him that I do not blame his party alone. There is an occasional sprinkling on the other side, for some reason or other that helps them out. It was better brought out by President Truman a few days ago as the real cause.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAVAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman not concede that when, after the war, the present administration issued a statement that industry could pay 20 percent higher wages without increasing prices, that was an inducement and encouragement to labor all over the country to ask for another 20 percent increase?

Mr. SAVAGE. Yes. He was talking at the time about a specific company that he said could pay it. I do not believe anyone thinks that everyone can pay that much additional wages and not raise prices.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAVAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Does the gentleman think that the hold-the-line policies of the OPA are preventing inflation?

Mr. SAVAGE. I think the weakening of OPA by our action here has broken the line and it is going to be very difficult to hold the line on all the other things now. It may be absolutely necessary to see what

point we have reached now, as far as inflation is concerned, and allow some of the other things to come up to that line.

Mr. GAVIN. Is the gentleman familiar with the fact we set up \$4,750,000,000 to pay subsidies to hold the line, we are not holding the line and we have inflation? The only thing we are doing is forestalling paying the bill. What are we going to do? How are we going to pay that \$4,750,000,000 which we paid out in subsidies? We are asking the boys who were over there, who were doing the fighting, to come back, take off their coats, go out and earn the money to pay the taxes for that which we have already spent. That is why their policies of holding the line are not proper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAVAGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is another question I want to ask. I come from southwestern Michigan where we have some cold weather, some snow and quite a lot of unemployment. The same is true in Detroit, where it is also cold. Does the gentleman know that many of the men who were former employees of General Motors and other companies are cold, that fuel is short, that food is sometimes short in their homes. They are in a pretty hard situation up there. The gentleman realizes that, does he not?

Mr. SAVAGE. Yes, they are.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Has the gentleman any explanation why it is some of these labor leaders are down here in Florida and some of the rest of them are over in big hotels in Detroit, Washington, and New York?

They do not seem to be suffering any. I am not criticizing them. No doubt they have business there, but I was just calling the gentleman's attention, as well as others on his side who criticize the General Motors officials so much, that the steel workers have their counterpart in the labor organization, when they sleep in nice beds and have good food.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAVAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. In paying these salaries to Wilson, who it is claimed gets \$465,000—I do not know how much he pays in income taxes, but it must be terrific—I would say that 75 to 80 percent is going to income taxes. Now, if we take away that income on which he pays that enormous tax, how are we going to pay for these subsidies? Somebody has to pay the taxes. How are we going to pay this bill? Is the gentleman going to be in favor, when the Commodity Credit Corporation comes in this year for another four or five billion dollars, of continuing these subsidy payments? Those men who, by the sweat of their brows, that the gentleman is talking about, have to

earn that money to pay those taxes to pay that bill. Is the gentleman going to be in favor of another five billion in subsidies, or whatever they may ask for, when the time comes in the near future?

Mr. SAVAGE. I would rather discuss the subject of wages now and take up the subsidies when they come before the House. I might say that if the President of General Motors got less salary and the workers got more—it must be remembered that the workers also pay taxes, and if they received higher wages they would pay more taxes, under the circumstances, so I do not think we would be entirely out of taxes.

Another thing, the president of General Motors receives as much pay as 197 of the employees, and that is no equality; 197 people that have families to take care of as well as the president, and there should be more nearly equal salary. I do not say they should not compensate an able man at the head of a corporation. I think they should, but 197 times as much as the employees get is a lot of money.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman again yield?

Mr. SAVAGE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A short time ago the gentleman made the argument that if good wages were paid it would increase the purchasing power, of course, of the workers, and hence the prosperity of the farmers and all the rest of the people; did he not?

Mr. SAVAGE. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All right. No matter what you pay the president of General Motors, he cannot eat it, he cannot take it with him; he has to spend it or reinvest it, and if he throws a big party—I do not know if he does—but if he did, or if Mr. Ford did, he has to pay someone, and he has to pay for the food he gets, so all the money goes back into circulation, and to that extent it helps general prosperity, does it not?

Mr. SAVAGE. That is right, but awhile ago I heard the gentleman say he did not like to see whisky made due to the shortage of wheat. I agree with him. Does the gentleman not think that some of this money is spent for whisky, and if the worker had it, it would go for food and clothes?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Please do not misunderstand me. I do not care what individuals want to drink or what they drink, that is all right with me, that is their business. But what I said was that if it came to a show-down between bread and butter, and whisky, I would take the bread and butter.

Mr. SAVAGE. And I would, too.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And milk would do more good, and my farmers produce a lot of milk.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a newspaper article.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. HARE, for 3 days, on account of important business.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 280. An act to declare a national policy on employment, production, and purchasing power, and for other purposes; and

S. 1480. An act for the relief of Charles R. Hooper.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 11, 1946, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1049. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1050. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Bureau of Mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

1051. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a copy of his annual report as Director for the fiscal year, bound under one cover with the report of the 1945 meeting of the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges, which precedes it; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1052. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the National Park Service; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1053. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of \$883,000 for the Federal Works Agency (H. Doc. No. 457); to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MARCANTONIO: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5117. A bill to amend title V of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to prohibit certain coercive practices affecting radio broadcasting (Rept. No. 1508, pt. II). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HESS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 5121. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy in his discretion to deliver to the custody of the State of Arkansas the silver service presented to the United States for the battleship *Arkansas*; without amendment (Rept. No. 1531). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk



for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Claims. S. 323. An act for the relief of Thomas F. Gray; without amendment (Rept. No. 1532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Claims. S. 400. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Andersen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Claims. S. 683. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Nepple, as executrix of the estate of Earl W. Nepple, deceased, and Mrs. Marie Nepple, individually; without amendment (Rept. No. 1534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Claims. S. 1400. An act for the relief of Robert R. Rowe, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1535). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Claims. S. 1423. An act for the relief of Charles L. Phillips; without amendment (Rept. No. 1536). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Claims. S. 1588. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lona Wilson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1537). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 210. A bill for the relief of Jack Williams and Mrs. Lora Sally Williams; with amendment (Rept. No. 1538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 238. A bill for the relief of William M. Silk and Henrietta Silk; with amendment (Rept. No. 1539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HEDRICK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1269. A bill for the relief of Virge McClure; with amendment (Rept. No. 1540). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1850. A bill for the relief of Louise Zerweck; with amendment (Rept. No. 1541). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2288. A bill for the relief of Columbus Thomas; with amendment (Rept. No. 1542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2813. A bill for the relief of J. W. Greenwood, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3513. A bill for the relief of Braxton B. Folmar, William Ernest Evans, Joseph Thomas Avery, and Roger H. Phillips; with amendment (Rept. No. 1544). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3523. A bill for the relief of Sam Damico and Clint Hamm, operating as the D and H Grocery; without amendment (Rept. No. 1545). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3525. A bill for the relief of Owen Young; with amendment (Rept. No. 1546). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4056. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jud Hendry and her daughter, Gladys Hendry; without amendment (Rept. No. 1547). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4121. A bill for the relief of

Augusta Board of Education; with amendment (Rept. No. 1548). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4297. A bill for the relief of Joseph Schell; with amendment (Rept. No. 1549). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4300. A bill for the relief of the county of Hawaii, T. H.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1550). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4545. A bill for the relief of George Leslie Dobson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1551). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 5424. A bill to prohibit the exportation of logs, lumber, and certain lumber products until the housing and other construction requirements for lumber are being currently met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 5425. A bill to release married men from the armed services; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 5426. A bill to provide for the training of officers for the naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 5427. A bill providing that all domestic air mail be transmitted at the same rate for each ounce or fraction thereof; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 5428. A bill to increase the monthly family allowances paid under the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 5429. A bill to amend the Immigration Act of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 5430. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification and compensation of employees of the postal service, so as to provide proper compensation to supervisors in the largest post offices and in other postal services; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 5431. A bill to further the development and maintenance of an adequate and well-balanced American merchant marine, to promote the commerce of the United States, to aid in the national defense, to repeal certain former legislation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 5432. A bill to provide for Federal aid to the several States in carrying out plans for industrial rehabilitation in the counties thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 5433. A bill to amend section 540 of title 10 and section 441 (a) of title 34 of the United States Code providing for the detail of United States military and naval missions to foreign governments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 5434. A bill reauthorizing the Gila Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. DE LACY:

H. R. 5435. A bill to extend pensions and other benefits to those serving during the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition to those serving in the United States revenue cutter service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 316. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 for readjustment benefits, Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GEELAN:

H. Res. 514. Resolution proposing methods for maintaining and preserving peace and at the same time eliminating compulsory military service from the policies and practices of all nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the use of the aircraft carrier *Saratoga* as a national shrine or its assignment for some other useful purpose in the San Francisco Bay area; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 5436. A bill for the relief of Leslie H. Ashlock; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 5437. A bill for the relief of Charles L. Wallace; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 5438. A bill for the relief of Maurice T. Sharp; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 5439. A bill for the relief of Thomas W. Williamson, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 5440. A bill for the relief of George Ledford, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 5441. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Wagon Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 5442. A bill for the relief of Frank L. Armistead; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1538. By Mr. GRAHAM: Two petitions containing the names of 200 Pennsylvania Railroad employees, in support of House bill 1737, the Railroad Pension Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1539. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of members of faculty of the Lincoln School, Racine, Wis., favoring continuance of the present OPA program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1540. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Local Union 112, United Construction Workers, United Mine Workers of America, A. F. of L., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their opposition to all legislation designed to curb or curtail the activities of local unions; to the Committee on Labor.

1541. Also, petition of Local Union 178, United Construction Workers, United Mine

Workers of America, A. F. of L., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their opposition to all antilabor and antiunion legislation; to the Committee on Labor.

1542. Also, petition of the executive committee of the Catholic State League of Texas, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the reestablishment of postal service between this country and our former enemies; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

## SENATE

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1946

(Legislative day of Friday, January 18, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who dost lift up our hearts to visions of a larger good:

"The world is weary of its pain  
Of selfish greed and fruitless gain,  
Of tarnished honor, falsely strong,  
And all its ancient deeds of wrong.

"Almighty Father, who dost give  
The gift of life to all who live,  
Look down on all earth's sin and strife  
And lift us to a nobler life."

In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, February 8, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On February 8, 1946:

S. 1590. An act to authorize the President to appoint Graves Blanchard Erskine, major general, United States Marine Corps, to the office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, without affecting his service status and perquisites.

On February 9, 1946:

S. 1467. An act to provide for adjustment between the proper appropriations of unpaid balances in the pay accounts of naval personnel on the last day of each fiscal year, and for other purposes.

### READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the Chair designates the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to read Washington's Farewell Address to the Senate on February 22 next.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Perry, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed

without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 105) to provide for proceeding with certain rivers and harbors projects heretofore authorized to be prosecuted after the termination of the war.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1118. An act to amend the Hatch Act; and

H. J. Res. 316. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 for readjustment benefits, Veterans' Administration.

### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

### BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs (Mr. THOMAS of Utah), which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,  
February 9, 1946.

HON. KENNETH MCKELLAR,  
President pro tempore,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: In accordance with law, I wish to submit the names of the following Senators as representatives of the Senate Military Affairs Committee on the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy for 1946: TOM STEWART, BURNET R. MAYBANK, FRANK P. BRIGGS, THOMAS C. HART, and H. ALEXANDER SMITH.

Most sincerely,

ELBERT D. THOMAS.

### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on February 8, 1946, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 380. An act to declare a national policy on employment, production, and purchasing power, and for other purposes; and

S. 1480. An act for the relief of Charles R. Hooper.

### PETITION AND MEMORIAL

A petition and a memorial were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A memorial of the Reno (Nev.) Detachment of the Marine Corps League, remonstrating against the proposed merger of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 13

"Joint resolution relative to the use of the aircraft carrier *Saratoga* as a national shrine or its assignment for some other useful purpose in the San Francisco Bay area

"Whereas the Navy Department has announced that the historic aircraft carrier *Saratoga* is to be inactivated and utilized with other designated naval vessels in atomic bombing experiments by the United States Government; and

"Whereas the *Saratoga*, throughout the recent war, operated in the Pacific with San Francisco as her continental home port; and

"Whereas this gallant warship has a remarkable war record, including participation in the battles of Guadalcanal, the Solomons, Bougainville, Tarawa, the Marshalls, Rabaul, Iwo Jima, and many others, as well as using its planes for successful air raids on Tokyo and enemy installations in various parts of the Pacific; and

"Whereas the *Saratoga* was credited officially with the destruction or disabling of several enemy cruisers, destroyers, and other warcraft that helped insure safe landings for our armed forces on enemy-held territory; and

"Whereas the San Francisco Call-Bulletin and the people of San Francisco have launched a drive to save this great aircraft carrier from destruction, even for scientific research, and to convert it into a national shrine or make it available for naval training purposes or other useful objectives in San Francisco Bay; and

"Whereas the designation of the vessel for such purposes would be a memorial to the men who served on the *Saratoga* and sacrificed their lives in action on her, as well as an honor to those members of the armed forces who served aboard her during the recent war: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Navy are respectfully requested to withdraw the aircraft carrier *Saratoga* from the list of warships scheduled for destruction in the contemplated atomic bombing experiments, pending arrangements that are being made by the people of San Francisco to perpetuate the vessel as a national shrine, or its assignment for some other useful purpose in the San Francisco Bay area; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution by air mail to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

### REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4652) to provide credit for past service to substitute employees of the postal service when appointed to regular positions; to extend annual and sick leave benefits to war service indefinite substitute employees; to fix the rate of compensation for temporary substitute rural carriers serving in the place of regular carriers in the armed forces; and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 927) thereon.

### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1816. A bill to authorize the return of the Grand River Dam project to the Grand River Dam Authority and the adjustment and settlement of accounts between the Authority and the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1817. A bill to provide for hospitalization and treatment of veterans in nongovernmental hospitals; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1818. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as